Manchester
College Library
North Manchester, Indiana

Gift of

The Author

Class Book

Presented to Manchester College Library by the author.

Christ and the Doctors

# MODERNISM AND THE REFORMATION

BY

JOHN BENJAMIN RUST, PH.D., D.D.

Author of "The Trend of History," "The Music of the Hebrews and the Religion of Israel," "Standards of Value," "The Gnostic Heresies"

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1914, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 125 N. Wabash Ave.
Toronto: 25 Richmond St., W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

Z 10.6
R92

To the Memory of

MY FATHER AND MOTHER

This Volume is Gratefully Dedicated

11603

# PREFACE

IN the midst of a busy professional life the leisure hours of more than two years have been devoted to the preparation of this work, which grew out of several discourses delivered by the author before the Faculty and students of Heidelberg University, Tiffin, Ohio, and the Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio. Those addresses are now given in this enlarged and more permanent form to the general reader, in response to the request of a number of friends who heard them, and to make the result of the research and labour expended upon them available, and, if possible, helpful to any one whose inquiries into the history of Christianity, the problems of our time, and the means that are necessary to guide and conserve the future in relation to the eternal verities of Divine Revelation and the message of the Gospel, may lead him to scan also the pages of this book. Despite the fact that many original sources of information, and antiquarian records as well as volumes of more recent date have been consulted and the material has been carefully sifted to prepare these essays on "Modernism" and the "Reformation," so as to secure a wide and reliable survey of the field under investigation, the writer is fully aware of the limitations of his work in certain directions. The literature, however, which treats of

the subject is so vast that one can at once perceive the utter futility of the attempt to review, analyze, and interpret exhaustively, within the compass of a single volume, even the more serious and enduring works which have been written upon this theme. The movement toward liberation from the oppressive yoke of Medievalism, beginning repeatedly here and there in former periods of the Church's history, finally reached its consummation in the sixteenth century, mainly in Switzerland, Germany, England, France, and The Netherlands. For this reason it is impossible for the men and women of the present age, especially in America, to understand the spirit and aim of the Reformation and its results, without an adequate acquaintance with the achievements of the great men of that period. Moreover, an unprejudiced and truth-loving inquiry into the history of human thought, as affected and determined by Christianity, will prove that beneath the outward, traditional, inherited and often tenacious religious affiliations of men there lie unchangeable, fundamental conceptions and facts of religion, common to all, just as in racial demarkations and political differentiations there is the ultimate substratum of generic humanity, and that therefore above and beyond this intervening belt of multifarious and variegated distinction in creed, sacrament, and cultus there must lie the prophecy, the possibility, and the final realization of the universal, New Testament priesthood of believers, and the brotherhood of man in Jesus Christ.

Several interesting and valuable mezzotints accompany the volume. The picture of Pope Gregory VII

was made from a portrait which Goethe, at the close of his Italian journey, took back with him to Germany for Professor Johannes Voight's biography, *Hildebrand als Papst Gregorius der Siebente und sein Zeitalter, aus den Quellen Vorgestellt,* Weimar, 1846. Professor Voight, a Lutheran pastor, and a teacher of Church History in Bonn, Germany, wrote the life of Gregory VII in so conscientious a devotion to the testimony of history, and with such mastery of the sphere of the true historian, that his work was immediately translated into the leading Romance languages of Europe. The Bishop of La Rochelle, Clemens Villecourt, entered into epistolary correspondence with him and exhorted him to declare himself a son of the Catholic Church, in the light of the great memorial he had erected as a friend or combatant of the Holy See. Professor Voight answered that he also acknowledged and worshipped one God, professed one faith, the true Christian faith, revered one Church, the Universal Communion of all pious, upright, and consistent Christians, and one Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of Christians everywhere, and the Fountain of all salvation. But he declined to ascribe these prerogatives to the so-called Roman, or Catholic, faith, or to the Roman Catholic Church, with her claim that she is the only saving church, or to that priest in Rome, who, by his followers, is called the true head of the Church. Gregory VII, small in stature, dark complexioned, and unprepossessing in appearance, but seasoned in administrative power and conviction, abrogated Investiture, uncompromisingly

fought the sin of Simony, which had become the curse of the Church, and had been condemned by five Church councils, from 1049 to 1071, and, against bitter opposition, introduced the practice of priestly celibacy into the Church. He realized part of his plans, and in much else he failed. He solemnly believed that he was the Vicegerent of Christ upon earth. When dying he said: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile."

Another mezzotint is a picture of Pope Innocent III, by some historians accounted the greatest of the Roman Pontiffs. Von Hurter says: "When one weighs everything that he willed, achieved, and planned, one is moved to confess that the dreams of Gregory VII were gloriously fulfilled in the time of Innocent III. The movements which merely germinated under the former came to fruition under the latter. The ideal of a visible headship of the Church, for which Alexander III contended and suffered with old Roman tenacity and fortitude, Innocent III, with less conflict, brought to realization. In a long chain of predecessors and successors, all of them inspired more or less keenly with the same idea, Pope Innocent III stands out majestically as the one in whom that idea reached fullest consciousness and most profoundly influenced and guided the activities of mankind. The picture was copied from a copper engraving in Frederic von Hurter's *Geschichte Papst Innocenz des Dritten und seine Zeitgenossen,* which was made from a miniature secured in the city of Rome, for Von Hurter's work, by Albert von Haller, a son of Karl Ludwig von Haller, who was a student at the

time in the *Collegio Germanico,* and secured a copy of a fine painting of this Pope by an eminent artist. This miniature belonged to a collection of medallions of the Popes, assembled with great care and circumspection, and was regarded as being the best and most authentic likeness in existence. It strongly resembled the portrait in the *Annales Ecclesiastici* (12 vols., 1588-1607) by Baronius, learned Vatican librarian, who had the picture copied from the painting, which hung in the Palace of the Conti, and with which every one was familiar. Thus, coming down to our time through so many centuries, from a period in which the art of painting was crude, and photography unknown, we may accept the accompanying mezzotint of Lothar, Count Segni, Pope Innocent III, as a reasonably well authenticated likeness. Gregory VII and Innocent III are the chief exponents in Medieval Christianity of the ideal, means, and realizations of ecclesiastical absolutism, which will never again in such measure appeal to the minds and hearts of men. These personalities and faces stand apart. Therefore it is worth one's while to own the pictures of them in this book.

The love of truth is the motive which governs the writer. Not a single word in these pages sprang from malice or ill-will. We seek fraternity in the truth. Error, mistaken conclusions, unfounded impressions, race prejudices, dogmatic utterances, and traditions unsupported by ultimate verifiable documentary evidence, provisional ecclesiastical names and terms whose origin is misunderstood, or enshrined in the environment of some local historical drift of faith,

when taken alone, are causes of division, segregation, unneighbourliness, and enmity. The supreme and guiding impulse and purpose on the writer's part have been, and are now, to bear witness to the truth in kindness and love. God forbid that we should ever even unwittingly do harm to any man or woman, living or dead, or prejudice any great movement in the tide of times, by misstatement, misapprehension, or misrepresentation. It is our prayer that historic, philosophic, Biblical, and doctrinal Truth may prevail in the consensus of mankind. "But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, He who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased: and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." (Matthew 23: 8-13.) It would be helpful to us all to take to heart the admonition of Dr. Frederic Schleiermacher in his sermon on the words of Jesus, "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned." (Luke 6: 37.) We know full well, he says, that no human letter exhausts and wholly comprehends eternal truth. But this we also know, that well-meant mistakes are most safely corrected in fraternal fellowship. Everything, therefore, for us ought to depend upon the sources from which our fellow Christians receive their doctrinal views, and whither they are led by them. Many of those who were condemned

by the ecumenical councils of the Church, and whose anathemas our Confession reiterates, in reality did not aspire after anything else than to glorify God, and so to state their views as to express in the purest manner their exaltation of Christ, in harmony with the glory of God. And such persons must remain receptive for the instruction of those who are like-minded. When even so sharp a difference in view arises between those who are like-minded, that the one must be wrong when the other is right, the fact always remains that the one can harmonize with his idea what the other cannot bring into adjustment with it. Only so we see to it that from one's heart Christ is called Lord in deed and in truth, which according to the word of the Apostle can come to pass only through the Spirit of God. And if what he says seems false to us, we must assume that he knows how to harmonize it with his own attitude of mind, and as long as he justifies this contentment in Christian piety, we have no cause to sever our relations with him on account of a difference, which, after all, at best may be a weakness of the understanding. However, without doubt, when one makes it his aim to do so or his premises lead him to that conclusion, to deny the glory of the only begotten Son, and to place Him upon an equality with all others, and even to exalt others above Him, then of course he no longer considers himself one of our number, in so far as we constitute a Christian fellowship. But as far as he desires to be associated with us, we have no reason to deprive him of the privilege. On the contrary, it ought to be

gratifying to us not to have him withdraw entirely from us, because we can in that case still reach, and exert a wholesome influence upon him.

JOHN B. RUST.

TIFFIN, OHIO.

# CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . . 19

PART I

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE REFORMATION

I. The Principle of Protestantism . . . . 43

II. Dr. Hagenbach's Criticism . . . . . 55

III. Dr. Schenkel's Rejoinder . . . . . 67

IV. Schenkel's Interpretation of Protestantism . . . . . 78

V. Schenkel and Von Hurter . . . . . 88

VI. Von Hurter and the Doctrine of Transubstantiation . . . . . 96

VII. The Portrait of the Middle Ages . . . 108

VIII. The Modernists, the Mass, and the Holy Supper . . . . . 114

IX. Schenkel's Defection, the Virgin Birth, and Ethical Protestantism . . . . . 123

X. The Reformers and the Person of Christ 132

XI. The Gospels and the Virgin Birth . . 145

## PART II

## THE FUNDAMENTALS OF FAITH

I. The Definition of the Term . . . . . 165

II. The Anti-modernist Vow and Protestant Differentiations . . . . . 181

III. True Catholicity and the Invisible Church . . . . . 191

IV. Forms of Modernism . . . . . 209

V. Modernism and the Idealism of Edward Caird . . . . . 217

VI. The Virgin Birth and the Interpreters of Modernism . . . . . 234

VII. The Church and Her Ever-Present Lord 244

VIII. The Historic Christ and the Bypaths of German Philosophy . . . . . 255

IX. Recent Revivals of the Mythical Theory . . . . . 284

X. Loisy and His Conclusions . . . . . 302

XI. Rabbinic Lore and the Historicity of Jesus . . . . . 311

Index . . . . . 329

# INTRODUCTION

WHEN the Modernistic controversy was at its height in the Roman Catholic Church, the author of the present volume became deeply interested in the movement. Its exponents and their followers were so courageous and fearless in their search after truth, so earnest in spirit, so well equipped with learning, and so thoroughly convinced of the justice of their cause, that any thinking person who wished to remain abreast of his time, and to understand the trend of a doctrinal, ecclesiastical, and social current of such magnitude, could not regard the conflict with indifference. Moreover, by the drift of things it was discovered that a great many popular magazines and Protestant Church papers misconceived and misconstrued the movement. From a superficial glance at the tumult and the fragmentary controversial statements in the daily periodicals, they drew the mistaken conclusion that the hour of a new upheaval, revolutionary, progressive, world-wide, and unconquerable, had dawned within the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. A large number of Protestant ministers shared and for a time gave currency to this view, and for a series of years there seemed to arise a willingness among them to form alliances with the Modernists. The trend in this direction exhibited considerable momentum, until by repression, ecclesi-

astical humiliations, and excommunications, Modernism lost its organization within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church.

It is generally believed, however, that the tendency to move forward and gradually to eliminate antiquated articles of belief and forms of worship, and to modify to some degree the more pronounced and crystallized elements of Medievalism, still exists in the minds of many of the younger priests who have enjoyed a period of training in modern scientific schools, following the conservative influences of Catholic home-life, and prior to their study of theology. Thus, distinctly apart from the momentum of fixed dogmatic conceptions and of the almost irresistible sway of ecclesiastical government, with an ancient name and an ancient creed, a well authenticated doubt, fed by fundamental truth, though long repressed and fiercely fought, still lives on in thoughtful minds, is nursed in the secrecy of the heart, prods the conscience, seeks the light, and presses to be known, to manifest itself, and to unfold in a visible form fitted for it, which God means it to have and which it receives from God. One may with freedom declare and teach fundamental truth, but one cannot legislate non-existent truth into existence and make it eternal. An ecumenical council may restate the authorized content of divine revelation, but it is utterly impossible for an assemblage of ecclesiastics, anywhere and in any age, to place reality behind a dogma, an ancient pious tradition, or a fancied article of faith, merely by solemn resolution, either in the realm of theology or in the field of physical science. Because

of the strange delusion that this could be done, Galileo, who, in the garden of Cardinal Bandini at Rome in the year 1611, after having demonstrated the phases of the planet Venus, by means of his telescope exhibited spots in the sun, and said that the sun is stationary, and that the earth moves around it, was arrested, forced to recant, and silenced by the Inquisition. Later on when he was tried a second time after Pope Paul V had given him audience on six different occasions, had been promised protection by Pope Urban VIII, in view of his discoveries, and had in 1632 published his book, *The System of the World,* in which he championed the Copernican heliocentric theory, he was again arrested by the Inquisition, and not only silenced, but in spite of his age, his genius, and his infirmities, and the solemn declaration he made that his writings did not contradict the Holy Scriptures, which are meant to teach religion and not science, was subjected to imprisonment, and to solitary confinement in his home until the day of his death in January, 1642, at the age of seventy-eight years. Thirty-seven years before Galileo came to grief on account of his discoveries, John Kepler, for teaching the same thing, was unanimously declared by the Theological Faculty of the University of Tübingen, a Protestant institution of learning, to be heretical because the book he had written on the subject of astronomy contradicted the passage in the Bible which says that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still. He answered that the Bible is not a manual of optics or astronomy, but has higher objects in view, and that the miracle wrought by God to prolong the day

to aid Joshua, the attempt to explain how this happened, is not a subject for inquiry. Nevertheless Kepler experienced a great deal of ill-will, vexation, and spite, and finally kept silent concerning his discoveries to escape insult, until through the death of Tycho Brahe, the Emperor Rudolph II appointed him Court Astronomer at Prague. By such repression and persecution the Copernican theory of the solar system was not destroyed, nor was the earth made flat by the intervention of a mistaken zeal in behalf of an inadequate dogmatico-theological view of the world, in league with a false scientific interpretation of the phenomena of Nature. True religion could not gain anything from an antiquated scientific conclusion, based upon preconceived ideas instead of experimental investigation, and read into theological belief. Science must be free.

In like manner in the field of ancient historical documentary evidence, especially in relation to the all-important fundamentals of Christianity and the Christian Church, a mere declarative judgment or canonical law will not place a mooted problem which naturally and justly belongs to the realm of criticism beyond the zone of doubt and inquiry until it has been solved. Neander says that from the standpoint of the Catholic Church the principle of authority asserts itself also here, and hence not only the canon of Holy Scripture rests immutably fixed upon the basis of ecclesiastical tradition, but an accredited translation of the same into the Latin language, the Vulgata, also passes down through the centuries as the inspired work of the Holy Ghost. At the same time the

Council of Trent refrained from giving a definite expression of view in this direction, and did not bind itself by the Vulgata, but left the matter open to two tendencies, a conservative and a liberal construction. On the other hand, when the question arises: where the genuine original documents are to be found, Protestantism, because of its logical development, can give no other answer than that this must be determined by investigation, as is the case with historical truth in general. Though from the Protestant point of view as well, the tradition of the Church marks the line of departure, this does not even in such a relation constitute a determining norm, but after one has followed its guidance conscientiously, one rises to an intelligent judgment concerning its correctness or incorrectness through the scientific consciousness. (Dr. A. Neander, *Katholicismus und Protestantismus*, p. 71.) The purpose is not to imply that this conclusion offers us only another term, to be substituted for "the right of private judgment," nor that the content of Christianity as a whole must in the last analysis be placed at the mercy of scientific and literary criticism. The scientific spirit is as much a living elemental part of the armour of the Church for the preservation, authentication, reformation, and promulgation of the Christian faith in its purity and credibility, as of the panoply of the enlightened individual believer.

We cite as an example the utterance of Jesus, reputed to have been made to the Apostle Peter, as recorded in Matthew 16: 17, 18, 19, whose interpretation has been a subject of dispute for centuries. On

the one hand it has been thus far the chief textual corner-stone of the papal theory and system, despite the fact that patristic testimony does not sustain the view nor the dogma. On the other hand, for these reasons, and on the ground of internal evidence, the Roman Catholic contention has been as firmly and persistently denied. Tertullian, in his defence of the doctrine of the Trinity, against Praxeas, says that the Bishop of Rome (probably Victor, A.D. 190) "acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus," and entered into communion with the Phrygian churches, who had adopted the same gifts. Besides this, through the influence of Praxeas, he patronized the Patripassian heresy. Thus the founder of "Latin Christianity" accuses the Bishop of Rome of a twofold heresy, and the unquestionable inference is that when he recorded these events he had not heard of such an idea as the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome. Moreover, the earliest historic mention of the See of Rome is associated with the effort of Polycarp, the pupil of St. John, the Apostle, to maintain apostolic doctrine and suppress heresy in the Roman Church itself, into which the heresy of Valentinus and Marcion had crept. "He it was," says Irenæus, "who, coming to Rome in the time of Anicetus, caused many to turn away from the aforesaid heretics to the Church of God, proclaiming that he had received this one and sole truth *from the Apostles*." The discussion between Polycarp and Anicetus concerning Easter bears additional evidence to prove that the latter never claimed to possess superior apostolic authority, and that there existed at that time an inde-

pendence and interdependence of marked and characteristic type among the great churches of Primitive Christianity. (*Antenicene Fathers,* Vol. III, p. 630.) Tertullian in the course of time became uncompromisingly puritanical in conviction and sympathy, in company with a decreasing minority of the same class of believers in the Church. His failure to stay the rising tide of worldliness among the professed followers of Christ in the older historic communion embittered him and finally led him to sever his former relations and to pass over to Montanism. Montanism, originally a phase of Gnosticism in the better sense of the word, unfortunately assumed a sectarian form, and lost the principle of progressive spiritual enlightenment in ascetic holiness and disciplinary legalism, a movement which became incorporated with Latin Christianity. In his writings against the Church from which he had withdrawn, he interpreted Matthew 16:17, 18, 19, in keeping with his new affiliation. In his work on *Modesty* he says: "If you therefore presume that the power of binding and loosing has derived to every Church akin to Peter, what sort of man are you, subverting and wholly changing the manifest intention of the Lord?" Christ's Church it was which Peter built. "Men of Israel, let what I say sink deep into your ears: Jesus, the Nazarene, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, God raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be held by it." (Acts 2:14-37.) Peter, therefore, Tertullian adds, was the first to unbar, in Christ's baptism, the entrance to the heavenly

kingdom in which the sins that were "bound" aforetime are "loosed," and those which have not been "loosed" are "bound," as Ananias was bound with the bond of death, and the weak were "absolved" from the defect of health. Here Tertullian shows no trace of the idea of the supremacy of the Roman See in matters of faith and practice, as founded upon Peter and perpetuated by his successors. (Tertullian, *Modesty,* chapter 21.) Besides this, it is to be remembered that Tertullian, both before and after he became a Montanist, always believed in the early second coming of Christ and the destruction of the world, on the ground of a literal interpretation of the words of Jesus: "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." (Matthew 24:34; Mark 13:30; Luke 21:32.)

This *locus classicus* of the Papacy (Matthew 16:17-19) was never questioned as to its genuineness throughout the Middle Ages and the period of the Reformation. The Protestants simply argued the historical groundlessness of the assumption that Peter established the Roman Church and was its first bishop, in view of the fact that Jesus gave the power of the keys to all the Apostles (Matthew 18:18). They discriminated also between the person and faith of Peter, and the latter, his faith rather than his person, was made the corner-stone of the Church. (Dr. A. Immer, *Hermeneutics of the New Testament,* p. 146.)

Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur, the founder of the Tübingen school of Biblical criticism, as far as the researches of the writer extend, first questioned the historic authenticity of the Petrine commission as

recorded by St. Matthew. In his view the Pauline character of the Gospel of St. Luke is plainly indicated by the absence of any recognition whatsoever of an identity of the teaching of Jesus with the Law and the Old Testament, such as the Gospel of Matthew shows. The characteristic announcement in the Matthew Gospel concerning the fulfilment of the Law and its perpetual validity is unknown to the Gospel of Luke, which, according to the original reading of Luke 16: 17, applies this saying to the words of Jesus. It teaches that the Mosaic law came to an end already with the appearance of John (Luke 16: 16), and that since then, in opposition to the Law, the proclamation of the coming of the kingdom had begun.

Furthermore, the Gospel of Luke seems to discriminate against the older Apostles and in favor of the Apostle Paul. Most significant in this direction is the important utterance of Jesus to Peter, in the Gospel of Matthew, in which, by reason of his confession, he is esteemed to be blessed, and declared to be the rock upon which the Church is to be built, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail, and to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given, with power to bind and to loose, a primacy which the Gospel of Luke does not recognize in any way, and completely ignores. The same thing is true of the power conferred upon the Apostles to forgive sins and to withhold pardon (Matthew 18: 18), of which no mention is made in the Gospel of Luke. Baur does not hold that Luke rests upon a purer, more trustworthy historical tradition than Matthew, but that the chief difference between the two lies in the Jewish

particularism of Matthew and the Pauline universalism of Luke. (Dr. F. C. Baur, *Kirchengeschichte der Drei Ersten Jahrhunderte,* pp. 75-77. Tübingen, 1863.)

Dr. Thaddeus Engert, a recent German Modernist writer on Early Church History, reaches far more radical conclusions. After placing Matthew 16:13-23 side by side, in parallel columns with Mark 8:27-33 and Luke 9:18-22, by way of more effectual comparison, he enters into an extended analysis of the relative value and the historic descent of Matthew 16:17-19, which he calls the "Magna Charta of the Papacy." He holds that the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles lie at the very foundation of the Church. The origin of Luke 22:31 is traced to this Pauline apology. Peter's denial was one of the greatest offences against the Rock, but also against the Master Himself, who had chosen so vacillating a man for the apostolate and named him *Petros.* Luke 22:31 answers this doubt. Jesus knew very well that Peter would pay his tribute to Satan, but soon recover himself again and strengthen the brethren. The passage has nothing to do with the primacy. Engert looks upon John 21:15 as a subaddition of later date, to the Gospel of John, and as a passage quarried from the writings of Luke. Peter is again shrived of his disloyalty, and made capable and worthy to be the leader and shepherd of the flock. Peter is memorialized and honoured, it can readily be seen, because, like his Master, he died upon the cross. This again is an unusual circumstance and led to the elevation of Peter. But there is no sign here of an official preëminence

of the Apostle. Only hundreds of years later was there any ground for the primacy found in these passages.

By the opening of the second century various superior and inferior offices had necessarily arisen in the Church, but nothing like a monarchy. The inde-

Matthew 16 : 17 - 19. An interpolation of Matthew, in which, for once, the praise he deserves is lavished upon Peter before he receives the sharp reproof. From the fact that the Church is here spoken of, the conclusion is not forced upon one that the interpolation is of early origin. But one cannot take for granted that these lines were written during the lifetime of Peter, so that he himself could have read them.

J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Matthaei, Zweite Ausgabe, Berlin, 1914, Verlag von Georg Reimer. Seite 80.

enough the first trace of the primacy appears in the writings of Justin (about 155), in the time of Marcion. Marcion favoured the Pauline teachings. Rome, the capital of the world, contained a well-organized congregation, and had, through its central location, won a position of great influence and significance. Here Justin for the first time mentions the revelation which Simon, named Peter, received from the Heavenly Father. One can readily see that Peter receives equal rank with Paul in this instance, at the moment when the latter glories in the call to the apostolate which God gave him directly through Jesus (Galatians 1 : 1, 16). But even here the apostolic coequality of Peter with Paul is admitted, without any claim to

the primacy. Justin knows only Matthew 16:17. The two following verses are still unknown to him. Even Irenæus († 202), in his conflict with the Gnostics, rests in the beatification of Peter, and does not mention the Rock-man, nor the power of the keys, an argument which hovered immediately under his eye, in the context, and which would for his purpose have been conclusive. (*Ad. Haer.,* iii, 13. 2.) (In chapter iii, 4, Irenæus comments upon the passage in Matthew without any reference to verses 18, 19.)

Clement of Alexandria († 216) is unaware of the existence of these two verses, whereas from Tertullian (*The Prescription against Heretics, 22*), who died about 240, and Origen († 254) on, they come into play. Calixtus I (217-222) makes the first use of them in support of the primacy, by forgiving sins, hitherto unpardonable, through his divinely appointed power of the keys. Therefore through the exercise of his authority he breaks with tradition. The chain of evidence, Dr. Engert adds, closes here. Then he boldly proclaims his conclusion that Matthew 16:17-19 is of post-apostolic origin, that verse 17 was first interpolated, and that afterward verses 18 and 19 were injected into the text. Verse 17 dates from the middle of the second century, and verses 18 and 19 from about the year two hundred. If these verses were interpolated at about this time, then the claim that they are genuine words which have been derived from Christ is absolutely without foundation, and cannot present to mankind a unique spiritual verity. Christian apologetics in the dark days of persecution would never have sacrificed the prophecy of the

perpetuity of the Church, and the certainty of her triumph over the gates of hell.

In contradistinction from Dr. Ferdinand C. Baur, Dr. Th. Engert holds that both Mark and Luke rest upon a Petrine basis, and certainly would have known of this tradition of the Peter party, if it had existed at that time. The silence of these Gospels strongly argues the spuriousness of the passage. Matthew 16: 20-23, where Jesus calls Peter *Satan,* confusingly contradicts the commission to the primacy. Everything indicates that these verses originated in Rome near the close of the second century in order to defend the superiority of the Roman See, and to protect Roman tradition against the attacks of the Gnostics. The elimination of Matthew 16: 17-19 will bring the respective chapters in Matthew, Mark, and Luke into essential agreement and harmony. (Engert, *Die Sünden der Päpste,* Leipzig, Krüger & Co., 1910, pp. 15, 16, 17.)

The *Codex Sinaiticus* (ℵ) is the oldest copy, or at least one of the two oldest and most complete manuscripts of the New Testament in existence. The discoverer, Tischendorf, assigns it to the middle of the fourth century, about 340 A.D., the year in which the historian Eusebius died. It was copied from some older manuscript, and for a number of reasons is very valuable because of the help received from it to purify and settle the text of the New Testament. (See further Dr. Philip Schaff's *Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version,* Harper and Brothers.) If it were not for the evidence to the contrary, marshalled by Engert, one would not feel any surprise

to find Matthew 16: 17-19 in the Sinaitic manuscript. Dr. Bernard Weiss, on the other hand, concedes that Matthew adopted the promise to Peter from some source at his command, made Jesus foresee the founding of God's kingdom by Peter, who acts a chief part in the piece inserted from independent tradition (Matthew 14: 28-31; 17: 24-27), and by interpolating extensive intercourse material from the apostolic source (Matthew 18: 1-35), displacing Mark 9: 27, he has developed the instruction of the disciples in Mark into a continuous legislation for the kingdom of God. Thus Weiss, despite the admitted interpolations, seems to accept the genuineness of Matthew 16: 17-19. (Dr. Bernard Weiss, *Introduction to the New Testament,* Vol. II, p. 281.)

The purpose we have in view in presenting this lengthy prefatory history of the interpretation of the Peter-Rock passage in Matthew's Gospel is not to endorse the Tübingen conclusions, nor to urge the elimination of the *locus classicus* of the Papacy from the New Testament. Apart from the uncertainty of the origin of the verses (16: 17, 18, 19), they can as readily be explained in favour of Episcopal and Presbyterial church government, as in support of a monarchical or hierarchical form of administration. And the Satan charge of the Saviour against Peter can also be harmonized, on the ground of every-day experience in any Christian community, with the solemn and basic facts of the kingdom of God. As the world hates the Master, and His disciples as well, for His sake (Matthew 5: 11), so He is in like manner antagonized in the very mind and life of the Christian

community, because of manifest and manifold imperfection (St. John 26: 1-15).

Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur wrote a number of learned works, his epoch-making *Church History of the First Three Centuries,* his monumental *Gnosis,* and his *Life of St. Paul* ("Der Apostel Paulus"), in support of his view that soon after the death of our Lord a serious and angry conflict was waged between the Petrine and Pauline Christians, and that it rent the Early Church into two great opposing divisions, inspired by two adverse and fundamentally different conceptions of Christianity, but that for some unaccountable cause all trace of it, even in the New Testament, has been lost. The German Modernist, Dr. Thaddeus Engert, revamps this Tübingen view, which beyond a doubt rests upon insufficient evidence. On the contrary, the Epistle to the Romans (Romans 11: 1-28) and the Second Epistle of Peter (II Peter 3: 15) contain enough testimony to satisfy any unbiassed mind that St. Paul did not antagonize the apostolic mission of St. Peter.

Toward the close of the year 1912 Dr. Bernard Weiss delivered a course of apologetical lectures in Berlin, on the primitive congregations of the Apostolic Age, to supplement the able and warmly appreciated addresses of his associate, Professor Feine, on the same theme. He considered it an opportunity to make a complete final statement of his views regarding the development of Primitive Christianity. He believed that a thoughtful consideration of them will in more than one respect be exceedingly instructive in the midst of the present-day conflicts of the Church. He

there says that to secure a correct mental picture of the primitive congregations one must turn to the Revelation of St. John. In the vision which the Apostle John received from Christ, the Seven Churches of Asia are representative of the whole Church that he was to guide after the martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Therefore these seven churches are naturally the point of departure for the erection of an adequate and satisfactory historic birdseye view of the original Christian congregations. The first fact which impresses us is that two of those congregations were ultra Jewish-Christian, while the remaining five were essentially Gentile-Christian churches. The church in Smyrna was praised for firmness in meeting persecution from former co-religionists, the synagogue of Satan. The church of Philadelphia is commended for successful missionary work among the Jews. These things could not have happened had not those congregations been Jewish-Christian in type. Moreover, they were both differentiated from the others by the fact that they received only praise and no censure. They are the legitimate daughters of the church in Jerusalem, and like Stephen, the first martyr, suffered great tribulation from their co-religionists. (I Thessalonians 2 : 14.)

It was from Jerusalem, in fulfilment of the Saviour's command, that the mission to the Jews, engaged in trade, or held as prisoners, first went forth, not only to the borders of Palestine, but throughout the Roman Empire. Smyrna and Philadelphia must have been the fruit of this Diaspora missionary labour in the Gentile world. Asia Minor has for so long a

time been regarded as the missionary field of St. Paul that the congregations there came to be looked upon as Gentile-Christian organizations. The existence of Jewish-Christian churches has even been denied ever since the time of the Pauline Gentile mission, and thereby the proper understanding of many of the New Testament epistles has been made impossible. But the Revelation of St. John supplies unmistakable evidence that there were Jewish-Christian churches also in the Pauline missionary territory.

It would surpass the power of human comprehension if the first Apostles, to whom the Lord confided the mission to Israel, had failed to think of their compatriots out in the heathen world! Paul alludes to the fact, which was well known to the congregation in Corinth, that the other Apostles also, and the brethren of the Lord, but especially Peter, when on their missionary journeys, while preaching the Gospel in the congregations, were hospitably entertained among the people, in company with their wives. (I Corinthians 9:5.) The Apostle James, in writing to the twelve tribes in the Diaspora, evinces the most perfect familiarity with the Jewish-Christian congregations, composed as they were (James 1:1) of the humblest of mankind, similar to the churches in Smyrna and Philadelphia. Peter writes to the elect strangers who belong to the Diaspora in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Greater Asia, and Bithynia (I Peter 1:1), and only by the most careless self-evident misconstruction of these simple words has it been possible to represent the readers of both of the Epistles of Peter to have been Gentile-Christians, and

thus to cast doubt upon the authenticity of the documents.

The preconceived, untenable opinion in favour of this false conclusion rests upon the ground alone that the Acts of the Apostles do not contain any allusion to such Jewish-Christian congregations. The fact is overlooked that it was not the object of the writer of the "Acts" to record the history of the mission as a whole. It is far more plausible to conclude that Luke, the pupil of the Apostle Paul, traces his account of the development of the Church from Jerusalem to Rome, from the Jews to the Gentiles, and attaches the second part of it especially, to the history of his teacher, Paul, who, with his message of salvation to the heathen nations, actually, through wonderful Providential direction, reached the capital of the world. But the "Acts" do in reality contain indirect evidence of the existence of Jewish-Christian congregations in Asia Minor, which originated from the Mother Church in Jerusalem. It is emphatically stated that when St. Paul, during his second missionary journey, sought to extend his missionary activity in Asia Minor, he was forbidden by the Holy Ghost, or by the Spirit of Jesus, to labour in Asia and Bithynia. (Acts 16:6, 7.) Dr. Weiss says that this event possesses great significance for him, because thereby Paul, without further delay, reached Troas, and in the vision in which he heard the Macedonian cry, he devoted his second missionary journey to the people of his own race and nationality in Macedonia and Greece (Acts 16:10), and this European journey

awakened the purpose within him to press forward to the city of Rome.

Paul distinctly states the principle by which the Holy Ghost guided him in his missionary journeys. His work was pioneer work, and when once he had laid the foundation for Christianity in any district or province, he was not permitted to revisit the territory. (Romans 15:19. Compare II Corinthians 10:15.) In the heathen world Paul always began his missionary work in the synagogues, and therefore it was not only prudent but right that he should avoid the awakening of jealousy among other co-labourers in the mission. He must have been forbidden to go into Asia and Bithynia because Jewish-Christian congregations already existed there, which had been founded by other missionaries. Hence the book of the "Acts" indirectly corroborates the testimony we possess concerning the Asiatic churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, and those named in the First Epistle of Peter.

But the best testimony in support of this fact is found in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, as it is called. This letter was first written to the churches in Asia, and only after the fixing of the Canon of the New Testament was it ascribed to the Metropolitan See of this ecclesiastical province, the city of Ephesus. According to chapter four, the chief aim of this Epistle is to inculcate unity, and the opening chapter, which repeatedly reminds the Gentile-Christians that they have been received into covenant fellowship with Israel, shows that the great theme of the Epistle is the preservation of fraternity and peace between Gentile-Christian and Jewish-Christian churches. At

the same time there existed here as elsewhere purely Gentile-Christian congregations, like Thessalonica and Philippi, from the time of Paul's first missionary journey, as indicated by his Epistles, which differed radically in their customs and teaching from the purely Jewish-Christian churches, and might easily have given cause for disagreement and strife. (Dr. Bernard Weiss, *Die Urchristlichen Gemeinden im Apostolischen Zeitalter.* Hamburg, 1912.)

Apart from the effort Dr. Engert makes to revive the Tübingen hypothesis in its more pronounced form, it can readily be seen that the correct interpretation of any contested passage, like Matthew 16:17-19, so weighty and so profoundly important, cannot be determined by the arbitrary dictum, on a snap judgment, of a group of great universities, an assemblage of noted theologians and ecclesiastics, wedded to some man-made form of church government, or by the solemn resolutions of any company of Christian nations in behalf of a preconceived trend of religious and ceremonial preference, but must in the last analysis be decided scientifically, as far as the results of thorough, impartial, and competent investigation will forecast and permit. But come what may, this surely is the only method which can be maintained without challenge in the court of enlightened reason.

Mgr. Batiffol, who was banished from the University of Toulouse in 1908, according to his own statement (*The Constructive Quarterly,* Vol. I, No. 2, article: "Early Church History"), belongs to the conservative, or right, wing of the Modernists, as contrasted with Duchesne, Loisy, and Tyrrell, whom

he classifies as the left, or destructive, wing. He defines the latter tendency as "an attempt to reinterpret Catholicism by way of a radical exegesis and a no less radical philosophy of religion." The other current in the French group laboured to endow Catholicism with a needed "history of its dogmas, sacraments, and institutions," and its supporters were "helping to build up such a history." Now, Paul Sabatier, a brilliant and daring Modernist, made the written statement that "the first link in the golden chain created by Catholicism to connect its hierarchy with the Apostles is a myth." Such a process is not only vital, but relentless. When guided and supported by sufficient verifiable evidence, it severs the tap-root of a priestly edifice, hoary with antiquity, and puts to shame any man in religious garb who has the temerity to proclaim from the sacred desk that St. Peter was the first Pope, and that as such he lived for twenty-five years in the city of Rome. But in answer to Paul Sabatier's statement, Batiffol quotes with approval the attempted reply of the Jesuit Père Yves de la Brière to the Archbishop of Fuzet:

"The works which have been appearing for some time in the collections, periodical or otherwise, of religious sciences, will perhaps not be without their usefulness for the refutation of this radical thesis. They will, we believe, help seminary professors to establish it more and more solidly that the first links of the chain between Catholic Christianity and the Gospel of Christ are very real links and of pure gold."

The ulterior aim in this case is to follow the paths of literary criticism for the purpose and in the hope of buttressing the Roman Catholic Church and her traditions. It is needless to say that this aim lacks both the untrammelled motive of scientific research and accuracy, and the freedom of evangelical faith in the unadulterated teachings of the New Testament. The foundations of Divine Revelation are, and must be, broader than any partisan movement, however venerable, historically significant, and majestic, whose beginnings cannot be securely traced to the fountain-head of Christianity, but die in the intervening zone beyond the border line of the Apostolic Church. The essential and ultimate evidence of God's revelation of His mercy and love in Jesus Christ, for the salvation of the world, possesses an entirely different character, and the process of verification follows other paths. Any student of evidence, in literary criticism, when under the spell of some radical philosophical theory of religion, or when prejudiced in favour of some ecclesiastical or dogmatic system, will surely run aground in his effort to reach the historical springs of Christianity, and to account for the saving power of the Christian faith. Ultimate Gospel Truth is not found in, nor does it enter by, such channels.

# PART I

# THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE REFORMATION

When the prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him. DEUTERONOMY 18:19.

But he said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it. ST. LUKE 11:28.

It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. ST. JOHN 6:63.

# I

## THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTESTANTISM

MANY years ago leading theologians of Europe and America, especially in Switzerland and Germany, began to make an analytical and scientific study of the causes and character of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. They taught that the philosophy of the Reformation consisted in two principles, the formal and the material. Upon this synopsis the most of them agreed. The material principle they understood to be the great fundamental Pauline doctrine of the justification of the sinner before God by the merit of Christ alone through faith. They taught that the formal principle is the Word of God, as it has been handed down to us in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, as the pure and proper source, as well as the only certain measure of all saving truth.* This terminology seems, however, to be of rather late origin, and does not appear in the confessional and dogmatical writings of the first and second periods of the Reformation. According to Heppe the *Verbum Dei* preceded the *justificatio fidei.*† The Old Protestant doctrinal position was, that the one source and norm of Christian teaching is the Word of God, which is contained in the prophetic and apos-

* Dr. Philip Schaff, *The Principle of Protestantism*, pp. 55, 70.

† Dr. H. Heppe, *Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus.* Locus I, *De Scriptura sacra.* Locus XV, *De Justificatione.*

tolical books of the Old and New Testaments. These books, therefore, have always been looked upon by the Church of all lands and ages as canonical books and as the unequivocal and exclusive record of the revelations of God. Neither Luther nor Melanchthon defined the inspiration of the Scriptures. They regarded them as a fixed guiding norm of fundamental testimony for the activity of the Holy Spirit in and through the Church in all future generations. Melanchthon differentiated very rigidly between the Word of God and Holy Scripture. In addition to the Bible, the confessional utterances of the great ecumenical councils were held to be binding, but conditioned by, and dependent upon, Holy Scripture.*

The doctrine of justification by faith in the old Protestant teaching is the real centre and pivot of the sum total of Gospel testimony. It contains the heart of the redemptive work of Christ, points out to the minds thirsting for salvation the inexhaustible comfort possessed by the Gospel, and is the basis of the difference between the uplifting Christian worship of God and the cult of pagans and Pelagians, who seek the justification of man by the works of the law, and by penances, and teach that it is impossible in this life to attain to the certainty of salvation.†

Roman Catholics hold that the Church is older than the Holy Scriptures, that these proceed from her, and that Protestantism arbitrarily reverses this relation. They teach that the canon of Scripture itself was collected and fixed by the Church, and that therefore the

* Heppe, *Dogmatik*, Vol. I, p. 207.
† Heppe, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 262.

interpretation of the written Word of God remains the express prerogative of the Church, with the help of tradition. But even the great Roman Catholic historian and apologist, Moehler, says: "Without the Holy Scriptures, in which the Gospel was first embodied, the Christian doctrine could not have been preserved in its purity and simplicity, and it is certainly a great want of right feeling toward God to speak of them as accidental, because they may seem to have sprung from merely accidental occasions. What a conception of the regency of the Holy Spirit in the Church! Without the Scriptures, moreover, the first link of the Church would be wanting, leaving it thus without any proper beginning, and for this reason unmeaning, confused, and chaotic. Without a continuous tradition on the other hand, in the sense of the regenerated reason, the Christian consciousness in the Church, all higher sense for the Scriptures would fail us, too, since without intermediate links we could not be conscious of any connection. Without the Scriptures we could not form any complete image of the Redeemer, for trustworthy material would be wanting, and thus all must be made uncertain through fable. Without a continuous tradition, the spirit and interest would be wanting to form for ourselves any such image, and the material as well likewise, for without tradition we should have no Scripture. Without the Scriptures the peculiar form of the discourses of Jesus would be withheld from us. We would not know how the God-man spoke." *

The view which seeks divine sanction for the exist-

* Moehler, *Ueber die Einheit der Kirche*, 1825, p. 60.

ence and exercise of ecclesiastical authority, antecedent to and above the written Word and testimony, loses sight for the moment of the canon of the Old Testament, with its law and prophecy, which foretold and awaited the coming of Messiah in the fulness of time. The primitive disciples and apostles of our Lord had been prepared for Israel's salvation by a distinct norm and written record of the redemptive purpose of God. Hence Dr. Bernard Weiss forcefully says: "It is certain that until the middle of the second century no other canon was set up in the Church than the Word of God, that is, no other normal authority which could take its place beside the Word of God in the Old Testament. Not only the writers of apostolic times, but Jesus also, refer to the Old Testament as *the Scriptures*. Already very early in the history of Christianity, because of the falsification and mutilation of the apostolical writings by the Gnostic heretics to gain support at any cost for their erroneous doctrines, on the one hand, and on the other, to prevent the utter loss of the living word of Jesus and His immediate followers, the original founders of the Christian community in the world, the apostolical writings, carefully differentiated from all spurious documents and apocryphal gospels, were collected and closed as the accepted canon of the New Testament Scriptures, and placed side by side with the Old Testament. Thus the life, teaching function, and authority of the Church are intimately, fundamentally, organically associated with the written Word of God." *

*Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, Vol. I, p. 28. Funk and Wagnalls.

As far as my own researches extend, Dr. August Detlev Christian Twesten (1789-1876), a pupil of Schleiermacher, but who afterward became a devotee of Lutheran orthodoxy, was one of the first Protestant theologians who assigned two principles to Protestantism. Whether or not Schleiermacher made use of this classification, or analysis, I am not prepared to say. The usage seems to have been more common among Lutheran than among Reformed theologians. Dr. Philip Schaff, professor of theology in Mercersberg College, utilized this same terminology in his famous inaugural address, delivered in Reading, Pa., October 25, 1844. This address was afterward enlarged and published in book form, with an elaborate prefatory commentary and defence by Dr. J. W. Nevin. An excellent account of that epoch-making event in American Christianity is given by Rev. Dr. J. I. Good in his *History of the Reformed Church in the United States*. But Dr. Schaff assigns a secondary place to the material and formal principles, or associates them with a deeper movement in history, the law of historic development.

In this new interpretation of the Reformation, supplemented by Dr. Nevin's introduction, we possess, in all probability, the first extended and exhaustive application of the Hegelian philosophy to the study of Church History from the evangelical standpoint. Dr. Schaff was but twenty-five years old at the time, and therefore his achievement not only called forth the wonder of many, but also led to a charge of heresy, which the opponents of the address failed to sustain. The principle of historical development differs from

the theory of *preformation,* which prevailed in the eighteenth century, and to which the Papacy is still wedded. The exponents of this view hold that nothing can be evolved which has not been first involved. Hence the Roman Catholic Church contends, on the basis of her own authority, the Scriptures, and Patristic tradition, that she is through the ages the unfolded plan of Jesus, the true and only saving Church. The scientific theory of evolution, on the contrary, begins with the predetermined life-germ, which unfolds under the modifying influence of environment, from within and without, in which some factors are known, and others unknown, and by a process of variation and adaptation under the law of natural selection.* Great critical minds in the field of philosophy and theology are in our time guided in their researches and conclusions by this more recently championed theory of development. Hegel says: "At its commencement, the Reformation concerned itself only with particular aspects of the Catholic Church. Luther wished to act in union with the whole Catholic world, and expressed a desire that councils be convened. His theses found supporters in every country." † Luther's onslaught was at first limited to particular points, but soon extended to the doctrines of the Church, and its institutions at large. Thereby he came into conflict with the authority of the Church. "Luther repudiated that authority, and set up in its

* Newman Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism,* p. 76. Charles Scribner's Sons.

† Hegel, *Philosophy of History,* p. 417. The Colonial Press, London.

stead the Bible, and the testimony of the human spirit. And it is a fact of the weightiest import that the Bible has become the basis of the Christian Church. Henceforth every individual enjoys the right of deriving instruction for himself from it, and of directing his conscience in accordance with it. We see a vast change in the principle by which means religious life is guided. The whole system of tradition, the whole fabric of the Church, becomes problematical, and its authority is subverted. [Luther's translation of the Bible has been of incalculable value to the German people. It has supplied them with a people's book, such as no other nation in the Catholic world can boast.] As a consequence the denial of the authority of the Church necessarily led to a separation. "The Council of Trent stereotyped the principles of Catholicism, and made the restoration of concord impossible. Leibnitz at a later day discussed with Bishop Bossuet the question of the union of the Churches, but the Council of Trent remains the insurmountable obstacle."

Since Hegel wrote these words, the Vatican Council in 1869 and 1870 has still further deepened the lines of doctrinal and dogmatic divergence between Catholics and Protestants. But the Modernists, within the bosom of the Church, in spite of her attitude of static quiescence and traditional authority, contend for the principle of growth, and for a larger spiritual vision, as the God-given right and privilege of the individual believer, under the guiding mission of the Church and in her fellowship, in union with the indwelling Christ. This is neither more nor less than the aspiration after the realization and enjoyment of the invisible Church

within the organism and bounds of the visible. While there are traces of this conception of the invisible Church in the centuries preceding the period of the Reformation, the name itself and the idea of a sanctified inner circle or kernel of true believers, which it represents, threaded through and mingling with the good, indifferent, and bad, or worthy and unworthy communicants of the outward, or visible Church, belongs distinctively to the great reformatory movement of the sixteenth century, and was first propounded by Zwingli, and then soon afterward by Luther. So we see that this Modernist aspiration and trend in the direction of the invisible Church trenches closely upon the conception of the Reformers, without being Protestant in affiliation or even in sympathy. "The Catholic Church is to Newman," says Barry, "the present, ever-enduring reign on earth of Messiah, who clothes in his great attributes the deputies that rule by His fiat." * Dr. Julius Müller says that when Roman Catholicism lays exclusive claim to the predicates of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan symbol, unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity, standing or falling with its hierarchical government, its sacrifice of the Mass and its priesthood, centring its unity in the apostolic chair, the Reformation does not place in opposition to it any similar assumptions, nor the sum total of the congregations as the true subject, growing up upon these predicates, but returns with invincible conviction to the idea of the invisible Church.†

* Dr. William Barry, *Cardinal Newman*, p. 130. Charles Scribner's Sons.

† Dr. J. Müller, *Dogmatische Abhandlungen*, p. 294.

In order to reach the conclusion that Dr. Schaff's treatment of the principle of historic development is not necessarily Romanizing in tendency, we need to compare with it the view of Cardinal Newman, who followed the same line of thought, but saw things from the Roman Catholic angle of vision. Cardinal Newman, we are told, resembled Shakespeare in the lack of exhaustive world knowledge, in the scientific sense. He failed to acquaint himself with the writings of great German philosophers even with the aid of translations. French literature was to him practically an undiscovered country. The movements in metaphysics and biology were entirely strange to him. His genius was largely intuitive and spontaneous. "Newman realized, as others did not, that Christianity was fading away from public order; that Christians would be called upon more and more to exercise their individual judgment, to mix in a society no longer Catholic or Protestant, but free-thinking as was the later Roman Empire, sceptical, yet superstitious, corrupt, yet polished; and he began to provide against the evil day. His policy would have gone upon lines novel as regarded the immediate past, now irrecoverable, but identical with those by which Clement, Origen, Basil, and the early Fathers had guided their course under heathen rule. It was a programme for to-morrow which implied great and permanent losses, not pleasant to think of, a reliance on energy instead of routine, and what many took to be a change of front. By this time Darwin had published his *Origin of Species;* the Bible criticism familiar to Germany since Lessing had put out feelers in *Essays and Reviews;* Colenso

LIBRARY
1623

was applying his arithmetic to the Pentateuch; Hegel had been heard of in Oxford. Newman was alive to the signs of the times; he read and gave them a meaning. Events have shown that he was not deceived." * Dr. William Barry, from whom these words are quoted, is himself a Modernist.

Cardinal Newman has always been to me a profound mystery. Some regard him as the greatest pervert of the nineteenth century, and from one point of view justly so, because of the claim upon him of other convictions, other interpretations of Scripture and history. And yet on the other hand by his grasp, explanation, and adaptation of the modern world view, he breathed a new consciousness, a fresh life, and a nobler purpose into Roman Catholic Christianity. "To him, if to any one man," says James Anthony Froude, "the world owes the intellectual recovery of Romanism. Fifty years ago it was in England a dying creed, lingering in retirement in the halls and chapels of a few half-forgotten families. A shy Oxford student has come out in its behalf into the field of controversy, armed with the keenest weapons of modern learning and philosophy and wins illustrious converts, and has kindled hopes that England herself, the England of Elizabeth and Cromwell, will kneel for absolution again before the Father of Christendom. Newman by the solitary force of his own mind has produced this extraordinary change. What he has done, we will see; what will come of it, our children will see." †

* Barry, *Cardinal Newman,* pp. 87, 88. Charles Scribner's Sons.

† Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*—The Oxford Counter-Reformation, Vol. V, p. 195. Scribner's.

It is evident that Dr. Philip Schaff, when he sought the ultimate principle of Protestantism in historic development, as set forth in his inaugural address, foreshadowed, as has already been shown, another, and in a sense a higher interpretation of the Reformation, in keeping with the promise and fact of the continuity of Christ's Kingdom and the mystic manifestation through the ages of His Divine Personality, resident in the community of believers. But some years later Dr. Daniel Schenkel, a Reformed theologian, connected with Heidelberg University, in the Palatinate, an independent and progressive investigator, who, through his extensive literary and critical study of the causes of the Reformation, had become one of the leading authorities on the subject in Europe, challenged the time-honoured practice of analyzing the beginnings and growth of Protestantism into the formal and material principles. He says: "Protestantism must therefore be conceived to be an organic whole, and it is an error by way of custom to speak of a number of principles. When one says that the doctrine of justification by faith is the so-called material principle of Protestantism, an essential moment in Protestantism is exchanged for a principle of the same. Through faith one becomes a Christian and a Protestant, but already for this reason that faith belongs solely to the region of individual life, it cannot be designated as that through which Protestantism differentiates itself from Catholicism as a world historical power. Justifying faith has also become a dogmatic concept. Between Catholic and Protestant theologians there is discussion on this point. But an

idea which is in dispute, and in itself is not clear, and in controversy, requiring a more definite description to be understood, cannot possibly be employed to designate the essence of Protestantism. It is altogether incongruous to call the Holy Scriptures, or the original revelation in them, the formal principle of Protestantism. If Holy Scripture as the record of divine Revelation, is the rule by which everything that cannot prove itself in its origin to be divine revelation, must be eliminated from the body of Christian truth, then the Scriptures are not in themselves the primary essential of Protestantism, but only an historical criterion whose content is the aboriginal record of the facts of salvation. Justifying faith itself has a principle lying at its base, the ground of conscience which leads to freedom. The records of Holy Scripture in like manner contain an active principle, the content of revelation, whose fountain-head is truth. The actual principle of Protestantism, therefore, lies deeper than the traditional dual division represents. But it also goes further, for the subject made free in the truth has the mission to labour actively for the regeneration of mankind, in keeping with its ethico-religious destiny." *

* Schenkel. Article: "Kirche," in Herzog's *Real Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* 1857.

## II

## DR. HAGENBACH'S CRITICISM

IN 1854 Dr. Daniel Schenkel published a work in two volumes, entitled, *The Principle of Protestantism,** and in response to his request, conveyed by Dr. Ullmann, Dr. Hagenbach of Basel, Switzerland, a great Reformed theologian and Church historian, wrote a review of the book. He challenged, in a friendly spirit, the position of the author that one main pivotal principle underlies the Reformation of the sixteenth century, namely, the restoration of mankind through faith in Jesus Christ as the God-man.

In the preface to the second edition of his work, published in one volume (1861) containing seven hundred and eighty-six pages, Schenkel, profiting by the criticisms of his friends in the Church, explains himself further by saying that Protestantism was above all a movement of opposition against traditional ecclesiastical error, and therefore a return to primitive Christian truth. Hence in his book he devotes the first part to a presentation of Christian truth as the essence of Protestantism. In view of the fact that this precious primitive heritage of truth was manfully defended against every assailment, the second part of

* Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus,* Schaffhausen, 1862, pp. 15, 16.

the volume treats of Christian freedom. The effort and aim of Protestantism to create a new Christian community, and to accomplish the unity of all Christians in a free ethical communion in Christ, constitute the third phase of the essence of Protestantism. He hopes that his treatise may help to create the universal conviction that Protestantism is not a ready-made system, but an unfolding world historical manifestation of power which is moving forward toward undreamed-of developments. Protestantism is the spirit, the energy, the fulfilment of the Reformation. Therefore since its appearance it has manifested itself not only as a religious principle, but just as much as a spiritual, ethical, and social element of life, which penetrates every sphere of private and public activity, and to which neither individuals nor nations may be indifferent. Protestantism also at present interprets and solves the searching birth throes and battles of our time. Freedom or serfdom, progress or reaction of nations and of minds, political, social, ethical, churchly growth or inundation, are associated unalterably with the attitude which men, whose destiny is in the balance, assume toward Protestantism.

The second edition of Schenkel's work on *The Principle of Protestantism* preceded his *Characterbild Jesu,* based upon the Gospel of St. Mark and written in the vein of the New Testament critics, by only two years. It is difficult to account for so radical and painful a departure from the earlier and apparently settled orthodox evangelical views and convictions of the man. At Heidelberg University, Dr. Schenkel taught theology and held the position of university

preacher. He is spoken of as a distinguished representative of the liberal school, because of his prominence as a supporter of the Protestant Union, which originated in Heidelberg. Ethically he followed Kant, and in his opposition to vulgar rationalism, he followed Schleiermacher. He excelled as a pulpit orator. His sermons on the Gospel of St. John, entitled "Gospel Witnesses to Christ," which were delivered in 1851 and later, are deservedly famous examples of evangelical devotion, careful exegesis, and well-ordered thought, presented in all the charm of a classic German style and spontaneous eloquence. He sought to move men not only to faith, but also to action.*

Hagenbach expressed the greatest admiration for the masterly exposition of Schenkel, and declared himself to be in sympathy with the scholarly research he had made to discover the principle of Protestantism. But by this term he does not mean a philosophical or religio-constitutive principle, like the principle of Revelation. He does not use it in a narrow and suggestive sense. The principle of Protestantism is not philosophico-constitutive, upon the basis of an *à priori* idea. Schenkel will agree with him, he thinks, that not the least shadow of a motive was harboured by the Reformers to establish a new religion. It was their aim to restore, or rather to renew and revivify the Christian principle given once for all. If the principle of Protestantism is made commensurate with the principle of Christianity, then he concurs with Schenkel. The Catholic Church also lends allegiance to that Christian principle, and desires, even though

* Brastow, *The Modern Pulpit*, p. 152. Hodder and Stoughton.

through other channels, "the restoration of mankind through faith in Jesus Christ, the God-man. Not in the ultimate goal, pursued by both communions, but in the ways and means employed by them to reach it, the difference lies between them, and Protestantism, as Moehler correctly says, must be understood by its attitude of opposition to Catholicism. History shows that the Reformation movement originated from the weak places in the old structure, which gave occasion for and invited attack, and that the men who made use of levers and jackscrews to wrench the edifice from its moorings were not concerned with inquiries about a 'principle' that might be involved." Hagenbach contends that the battle waged between the old and new form of faith did not revolve around the historic facts of salvation, or the object of Revelation, but dealt in the main with the subjective communication or impartation of the divine gift. Schenkel holds that the objective Christ, the objective revelation of salvation handed down in the Scriptures in written form, is the foundation upon which the principle of Protestantism rests necessarily. Hagenbach heartily agrees with this position, but declares that the principle of Protestantism is not to be identified, or made commensurate with the Scripture principle. The object of the great battle was not to found a new religion, but to open the way to the holy place, which had been closed up, and the approach to which had been filled in with accumulations and obstructions.

The decay of the old Church had not only seized the periphery of religious life, understanding, and

conduct, but it had penetrated its centre, the very heart of it. The paths to the inner sanctuary of the heart had been walled in by a false theory of penance, which directed the burdened conscience to the doing of outward works, or to the treasury of the *opera supererogativa* of the saints, instead of demanding the thorough renewal of the heart and the social regeneration of the individual. The sources of religious knowledge were almost entirely sealed. The Bible was not only unknown to the people, but also to many of the priests, and was covered with a web of tradition. The freedom of religious life was restrained within the communion of the Church, because the organs of this communion were limited to a largely corrupted priesthood, under the authority of the Pope. A threefold result followed the Reformation: liberation of conscience from the yoke of the law and its obedience to faith; restoration of the pure doctrine on the basis of the historic revelation recorded in Holy Scripture; and deliverance from papal tyranny and the founding of a new ecclesiastical order on the groundwork of evangelical truth. On the part of Luther it was the rebellion and outcry of conscience, in the innermost depths of the religious sense, against the traffic in indulgences, which set the world on fire. This historic fact marks the actual beginning of the Reformation in Germany, though its sources lie much further back. Luther's conviction that the central point of religion is the relation of the heart and conscience to God, led, without any search theoretically for it, in an entirely practical way, to the material principle of the Reformation, *Justification by Faith.* Having found this

higher light in the Word of God, he in like manner unintentionally and most naturally placed the authority of Holy Scripture above the authority of popes, councils, and universities, and thus enunciated the *formal principle of the Reformation.*

The universal priesthood of believers began to be regnant in the place of the special predatory priesthood of the Old Church, and the Church could no longer be found in the directly visible presence of the papal establishment. A new fellowship appeared and asserted itself, based upon mutual understanding and the bond of communion with their unseen Head, Jesus, the chief shepherd and bishop of souls. This, to round out the other two elements, Hagenbach suggests, might be called the *social principle.* Schleiermacher, Klee, and Thiersch, as Schenkel shows, in various ways recognize this church-organizing principle to be essential in Protestantism, and that in its deepest character Protestantism is not limited to the sphere of anthropology, but passes beyond these two moments, and is organically social, livingly active, evangelically positive, constructive, and church-organizing in principle. The religious feeling had to breathe freely again in the consciousness of God's grace in Christ. *This is the material principle.* Knowledge had to escape from scholastic subtilty and ignorant superstition by the return to the source and norm of religious understanding. *This is the formal principle.* Religious conduct could no longer be determined by the mechanism of a priestly system of directions, but had to obtain its inspiration of the free religio-moral communion of faith, in one Master and Lord of sav-

ing truth, the real Head of the Church of the First-Born, "to make known the virtues of Him who called us out of darkness into His wondrous light." *This is the social principle.* In a word, it is a return from *superstitio* to *religio,* from the ownership to the freedom of conscience, from faith in authority in a bad sense to faith in authority in a good sense, from the servility and dependence of a compact church membership in the mass to the liberty of the children of God.

Hagenbach does not agree with the view which Goebel rather widely disseminated in 1837, that in the Reformed Church the formal principle is given pronounced expression, and that in the Lutheran Church the chief and distinguishing emphasis is laid upon the material principle. Luther was not exclusively wedded to the material principle, nor were Zwingli and Calvin exclusively exponents of the formal principle of the Reformation. In his controversy with Zwingli concerning the Lord's Supper, Luther clung to the formal principle with such an unyielding tenacity as to defeat the wholesome purpose and irenical spirit of the Swiss reformer. Nevertheless Hagenbach admits that with Luther the formal principle is conditioned throughout by the material principle. On the other hand, Zwingli and Calvin, and the Reformed Church as a whole, tended to assign such extreme abstract importance to the formal principle as to give the Law and the Gospel equal validity. At the same time it is erroneous to conclude that Zwingli and the Reformed Church undervalued or lost sight of the material principle. The *Heidelberg*

*Catechism* is built up upon this principle, for its aim is to lead sinful man to a knowledge of, and a deliverance from, his misery. It derives or deduces all moral responsibility in conduct and social relations from the feeling of thankfulness for salvation.

Hagenbach also questions the correctness of the later view of Herzog, that in the Lutheran Reformation we witness an attack upon the Judaism, and in the Zwinglian Reformation a warfare against the Heathenism of the Old Church. In large measure it is true that the material principle is essentially anti-Judaistic Paulinism, and that the formal principle, abstractly taken, leads to a sweeping uncompromising legalistic rigourism in relation to all pagan-like creature-worship and moral laxity. But when Luther nailed his theses onto the church-door at Wittenberg, and protested against the traffic in indulgences, it was the heathen indifference toward sin and repentance which roused the earnest man to world-heroic action. And when, on the other hand, Zwingli, pupil of Wittenbach, the famous humanist and fond reader of Plautus and Terence, declaimed against the worship of images in the churches, and simplified the furnishings of the Lord's house, he acted in the spirit of the Old Testament commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Reference is made to a work by Thomas, a Genevan, *La Confession Helvetique, Etudes historico-dogmatiques sur le XVI siècle, 1853*, in which the following differentiation occurs (p. 119): "Dans le luthéranisme l'élément germanique est essentiellement pur, dans la réforme il est essentiellement marié à l'élément roman.—Au point de vue

psychologique la réforme s'adresse plus à l'intelligence et à la volonté, le luthéranisme au sentiment. D'un côté une tendance plus intellectuelle et plus morale, de l'autre une tendance plus mystique."

Hagenbach closes his criticism of Schenkel's view and position with the following summary:

I. The Reformation of the sixteenth century as an historical event cannot be construed upon one principle, nor can the Protestantism which grew out of it be traced back to one principle; but science, on the contrary, must first, in an historico-genetic way, point out the most critical moments in the religious life which called forth the opposition to the Old Church.

II. This antagonism did not involve the objective apprehension of the facts of salvation revealed by Christianity, but their communication. Hence the energy of Protestantism is to be sought for not in the sphere of theology and Christology, but essentially in the sphere of anthropology, and upon the subjective side of the sphere of soteriology.

III. Since the Reformation set aside work-righteousness, and enthroned living faith; since it opposed the arbitrary traditions of men with the authority of Holy Scripture, everything which interrupted the free development and activity of faith, and hindered the study of the Scriptures, had to be eliminated to make room for the growth of the new spiritual fellowship, whose unseen Head is Christ, and in which every one anointed with His spirit is a priest.

IV. The Reformation, however, did not by these means inaugurate a new religion, but simply followed

the laws according to which the religious life unfolds, and thus opened a better way for a deeper inner relation of the heart with God, for religious knowledge, and pious activity in life, and to establish its fundamental practical principle permanently.

V. If one wishes to name these thoroughly practical fundamental "principles," by which the Reformers were guided, and with which theological science must deal, the designations *material* and *formal* may be retained. As a distinguishing name for the third element growing out of the other two essentials, he suggests the social principle.

VI. Though these fundamentals of spiritual vision were vitally active in all the Reformers, the personal gifts, and the individual relations under which they laboured, led one Reformer to emphasize one principle, and another, another. It must be admitted that in the Lutheran Church the material principle always takes precedence, and in the Reformed Church the formal and social principles are more prominent, the latter chiefly represented by Calvin. At the same time one cannot discover or establish a fundamental difference between the two Churches.

VII. The differences which appear between the Lutheran and Reformed communions in doctrine, cultus, organization, and morals are in like manner to be construed as historical, and not as *à priori* facts, and as dependent upon and to be explained by the relativity between the two, as shown in thesis number six.

VIII. These differences are not insurmountable, and it is a sad sign of the times that the old quarrels

which impeded the normal development of the Reformation have been conjured up again by the spirit of unholy rivalry. Science may continue to follow these differences to their sources, in order thus more readily to equalize them. On the other hand, bad service is rendered the Church when the science of criticism takes pleasure in giving permanence to the tension between these distinctions by an artful sophistry, thus hindering instead of encouraging the union.

IX. Though the Reformation (thesis 2) concerned itself more with the means of grace than with the sources of salvation, nevertheless a more vital apprehension of the former led to a deeper and more vital understanding of the latter, and hence both theology and Christology were affected by the regenerating spirit of Protestantism. Moreover, Protestantism, through the triumph of its specifically confessional principles, is conscious that the theanthropic principle which holds sway above confessional distinctions, that is, the root principle of Revelation centred in the reconciliation of man with God, accomplished by Christ, Son of God and Son of man, has been placed in its proper light, and brought to the apprehension of mankind.

X. Now if by the restoration of the means of grace, it is the mission of Protestantism to bring the objective facts of salvation upon which the Church rests to fuller apprehension, it becomes clear that this return to evangelical doctrine is not an apostasy from, but in reality implies a restoration of, the true Catholic faith. For this reason the mission of Protestantism,

it must be seen, will have been fulfilled as soon as, upon the one evangelical-Catholic faith, the one flock assembles under the one Shepherd.*

* *Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* Erstes Heft, 1854. Hamburg.

## III

## DR. SCHENKEL'S REJOINDER

IN his answer one year later, in 1855, Dr. Schenkel, after apologizing to Dr. Hagenbach for his belated response to the kind review, says in substance that the praiseworthy efforts of recent scholars to understand Protestantism in its essential character appeared unsatisfactory to him because not one of them succeeded in discovering and setting forth the one fundamental thought out of which the sum total of the phenomenon of Protestantism arose, including its various branches. He disclaims any disposition to find fault with the two laws of action under which, exclusively, Protestantism has been classified, and in which it has found its dogmatic consummation, the normative authority of Holy Scripture, and Justification by Faith alone, even though it is absolutely questionable to trace the origin of Reformed Protestantism to the former, and Lutheran Protestantism to the latter, in view of the fact that Luther rejected the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper because it does not rest upon the word of institution, and Calvin refused to endorse the Lutheran doctrine since it presupposes a certain mode of receiving Christ other than by faith.

History shows plainly that the most important doctrinal difference between the two confessions grew out

of the controverted point whether the objective word of God is independent of faith, as the Lutherans taught, or whether it manifests its power through the instrumentality of faith, as held by the Reformed, and therefore seems to him, Schenkel, to be artificial rather than historical to distinguish Swiss and German (Reformed and Lutheran) Protestantism, one from the other, by two such categories as the formal and material principles. He does not accept them as principles of Protestantism. He defines a "principle" as being something original, which does not need first to be derived from something else, but as unconditioned and independently conditioning, and taking precedence over everything else. The freedom with which Luther criticized the canon of Holy Scripture and condemned certain books, especially the Epistle of St. James, because the doctrine of justification by faith does not receive sufficient emphasis there, shows conclusively that Protestantism did not arise historically from the normative authority of Holy Scripture. Luther places the seat of authority in religion elsewhere. He commended the Gospel of St. John, the Epistles of St. Paul, especially the Epistle to the Romans, and the First Epistle of St. Peter, to Christians for daily reading, should they never read any other book, or receive any other instruction, because, as he said, "They are the books which show Christ to you and teach you everything which is necessary for your salvation."

Schenkel asserts that Luther nowhere speaks of the Scriptures as the "only treasury of the Church and its real head." But he does say this of Christ, and

that there is no salvation outside of Christ, and that therefore not Scripture but Christ is the original well-spring of salvation. With paradoxical courage Luther declared that having Jesus on his side, he did not concern himself about all the utterances of Scripture; that he placed Jesus, the Master of Truth, above Scripture, and that when any one pits the Scriptures against Christ, he appeals at once to Christ against the Scriptures. Schenkel rejects the view of the seventeenth century dogmaticians that the Reformers first agreed upon the meaning of the *locus de scripture,* and then erected the Evangelical system of doctrine in opposition to the Roman Catholic positions. Historically, Schenkel claims, Catholics and Evangelicals did not at any time dispute over the authority of Holy Scripture. On both sides silent assent thereto was given; but the representative Church opposed the freedom of interpretation demanded by the Protestants from the very beginning, because thereby her own prestige weakened more and more. Schenkel seems to give insufficient weight to the momentous battle which was waged for nearly two hundred years in Europe before the Reformation to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular, and distribute them among the people. Hence though writing from the Reformed point of view, he fails to recognize as fully as he ought to the importance and absolute necessity of the Bible as a divinely appointed and essentially inerrant witness to Christ. At the same time he admits that the study of the Scriptures delivered Luther from the errors and misleading adulterated traditions and teachings of the Church, and led him to Christ. Therefore he insists

that the Reformation comprehends both a recovery of the historic facts of salvation and the restoration of the true means of grace. He contends that the sources of the Reformation history have been imperfectly studied and flagrantly neglected, and that this accounts for the failure to see that the fundamental historical fact of Christianity, the fact of the Incarnation, in a most unevangelical way was forced into the background, and robbed of saving power by the Roman Catholic system as early as the Middle Ages. From the outbreak of the Nestorian heresy, Mariolatry and the worship of saints seriously robbed Jesus of the reverence due Him.

In the fifth century Cyril of Alexandria, in a sermon at the Synod of Ephesus (431) ventured to say: "Through the Mother of God the tempter was overcome and fallen man lifted up to heaven." (*Acta conc. Eph. I.*, p. 583 seq.) Before the year 600 in the Eastern churches Mary was represented pictorially as the Queen of Heaven, sitting upon a throne. The vicarious sacrifice of Christ with its shed blood, through which alone forgiveness of sins is obtainable, passes more and more definitely into the daily unbloody sacrifice of the Mass, and the enormous significance which the latter gradually gained in the system of Roman Catholic dogma and cultus unquestionably proves that within the Roman Church a gross defacement of the historic Gospel facts, the objective of Revelation, took place; that so unhistorical a fiction as the Mass could to so great an extent overshadow the eternally efficacious atoning death of Christ, the highest redemptive act, accomplished on the cross.

Therefore the authors of the *Heidelberg Catechism* knew very well why they taught in the famous eightieth question that: "The Mass in reality is a denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ on the cross," and at best all we can do is to object when the Mass is called an "accursed idolatry."

The Reformers were deeply convinced that in this one point an historic, the highest objective divine event of Revelation, was involved, and that in the Roman ecclesiastical system Christ is concealed, and in the Mass virtually denied. Having found the righteousness of Christ, Luther threw overboard the pretended scholastic righteousness of the reigning ecclesiastical institution. The full satisfaction for the sin of the world, consummated in the death of Christ, makes human satisfaction and the whole ecclesiastical system of penance superfluous. The ownership of conscience is broken as soon as the vicarious death of Christ upon the cross is accepted in all earnestness, for then the aid of a clerical office such as the offering of the Mass calls for is no longer necessary. In the vicarious death of Christ, the atonement is historically fulfilled without priestly mediation, and hence possesses eternal efficacy. The righteousness of Christ instead of man's righteousness is the first foundation-stone upon which Protestantism was built. This is proved conclusively by the confessional symbols of the German Evangelical Church, the Augsburg, the Helvetic, and other confessions. Neither German nor Swiss Protestantism grew out of the so-called formal principle. Like Luther in his sermon on "Christian Freedom," so Zwingli in his discourse in 1522 on "The Freedom

of Food," directed men to the boundlessness of the Grace revealed in Christ, saying that it is better to feed the heart upon Grace than to starve the body. The first Helvetic confession, of 1536, which Schenkel admits to be noteworthy, gives special prominence to the normative authority of the Scriptures, a distinction that does not appear in the first Basel confession, but explains that the Scriptures have no other purpose than to show mankind God's grace and good-will in Jesus Christ, His Son.

In like manner Calvin, in his massive and famous *Institutiones Christianæ Religionis,* serves us well to demonstrate that, despite the great reverence of the Reformed people for the Word of God, Reformed Protestantism did not arise from an abstract formal principle of Scripture. Calvin presupposes that in God alone certainty of salvation is to be found, and that the deepest difference between Catholicism and Protestantism lies in the fact that the former makes the certainty of salvation depend upon the priestly mediation of the Church, and the latter builds it upon the immediate fellowship of God. However highly the Catholic Church may esteem Holy Scripture, she reserves the right, as the representative of Christ on earth, and the living bearer of the gifts of Grace, to interpret them, and therefore Roman Catholicism lacks the sense of truth, which ever renews the figure of Jesus in original clearness and purity, free from all admixture of ecclesiastical error and traditional superstition. Hence the Roman Catholic Church in her interpretation of the Scriptures is static, and explains them in keeping with her own departures

from original, primitive, Biblical Christianity, whereas Protestantism interprets Scripture as it is in itself, and strives to attain to its fulness and power, not as a principle from which it arose, but as a witness to the unaltered, historic events in their unchanging truth, centring in the suffering, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Schenkel then continues his answer to his friend Hagenbach by a discussion of the doctrine of justification by faith, and seeks to show that because of the variation of view among the Reformers concerning faith and its relation to love, the doctrine cannot, strictly speaking, be named the material principle of Protestantism. He doubts the wisdom of the Lutheran Church in laying so much stress upon the words: "*justified by faith alone,*" since in Romans 3:28 the word *alone* is not used by St. Paul, the Apostle of Faith, who elaborated the doctrine of justification. Because of this want of clearness concerning the doctrine of justification by faith, Schenkel thinks many have failed properly to differentiate the *causa meritoria* from the *causa apprehendens.* The former is Christ, that is to say, His all-sufficient and eternally valid redemptive work. The second is faith, a subjective act on man's part, like the opening of the eye to the light of the sun. But here Schenkel departs from the traditional teaching of the Reformed Church, which describes faith as an act of the Holy Spirit in the mind and heart of man, and thus boldly and effectually eliminates any last lingering shadow of synergism. The sovereignty of God's mercy in the realm of Grace is made supreme, in harmony with

the sovereignty of God's omnipotent wisdom in the work of creation. Schenkel holds that one-sided predestinationism emphasizes the moment of Grace in justification at the cost of human freedom. He declared his position to be that there occurs a self-conscious, free moral act in man, whose objective ground lies in God, but whose subjective realization is not possible without the willing assent of man. At this point the doctrine of justification is cut in two by the doctrine of election, and we cannot escape the inquiry into the *origin* of *faith*. He does not agree with the "Form of Concord," because it teaches that before his regeneration man is no better than a block of wood, and that in conversion the subject is "*capacitas passiva*," or a mere "*passive se habere*," and because it is utterly impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that in conversion the subject is wholly inactive, and only then experiences a change of heart when the Holy Spirit is ready and willing to accomplish it. He hopes his honoured friend Hagenbach shares his conviction that anything man may do to further his own conversion and to experience justification by faith cannot in the least degree win meritoriousness for him in the eyes of God. To become a child of God man must experience an awakening of conscience and an anxious, penitent aspiration, or bending toward the saving mission and power of Jesus. Pure passivity belongs to the block of wood, but not to man. Schenkel says in his view the Scriptures stand higher than the "Form of Concord," and they teach that man did not become hopelessly passive through the fall, but that the law of God still remained written

in the hearts of men (Romans 2: 13), and that besides this the conscience of the heathen man continued to accuse and excuse him. It is his conviction that faith itself, on its subjective side, springs forth from the conscience, and is an ethical act of man, which was made possible by the richness of God's grace toward the sinner, who dealt far more mercifully with him than do the authors of the "Formula of Concord," and did not make of him what *they* have made, a merely passive block of wood, or an image of Satan.

In the main he argues with Harless that faith is the appropriation by conscience, without any subjective merit on man's part, of the atonement of Christ.* For this reason it always begins with an awakening of conscience, with sorrow for sin, and finds its consummation in a pacification of conscience, in the joy of confidence, trust, and peace. But this act of the soul is never complete and therefore always insufficient to justify us in the sight of God. The perfect righteousness of Christ alone is sufficient to cover our moral deficit and be our surety, that ultimately, through faith and the gift of the Holy Spirit, we shall be free from sin.

Schenkel regards this doctrine as one of the most important articles of the Christian faith, but says he cannot school himself to view it as the "material principle" of Protestantism. He misses in it the real *principium.* Faith could regain its significance in the evangelical sense only after Christ was again known as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. In the absence of this knowledge, the unrest of conscience finds a

* Harless, *Christliche Ethik,* p. 29.

false objective. It is not to be denied that one may pray in faith to " the Mother of God," and believingly revere a relic, even trustingly hold the stirrup for the Pope; but such faith lacks the commanding objective of salvation—Christ. Therefore the evangelical conception of faith is conditioned by its relation to Christ, that is to say, it is not a principle, but a deduction. Just why the doctrine of justification should be called the material principle of Protestantism, he says, is utterly incomprehensible to him, since according to his conviction, it all depends not upon the material substance, but upon a subjective ethical act.

In his work, *The Principle of Protestantism,* Schenkel says that among the undying services rendered by Schleiermacher, in opposition both to orthodox and rationalistic intellectualism, he called attention to the significance of fellowship in Protestantism, and commends his friend Hagenbach for his agreement with this advanced view, so much so as to lead him to suggest the addition of a third principle to the other two which have gained currency in the learned world, but which have already been shown to be unfounded and superfluous. If we follow the reformatory movement to its ultimate ground, trace it back to its principle, we find that the Reformation cannot be fully understood unless we realize that it arose from a more or less conscious protest and rebellion against the usurpations of divine authority by the Roman Catholic Church. Luther himself was not fully aware of this implication when he began his reformatory work. But in a short time he was swept onward to the logical conclusions contained

Gregory VII

in his premises and religious convictions. In merciless denunciation he compared the papal court with Babel and Sodom. The Papacy itself he looked upon as antichrist, and he denounced the Roman bishops as the emissaries and vicegerents of Satan.

Schenkel expressed the view that the discussion of the various tenets which lent support to the Reformation unmistakably drew the attention away from its great underlying purpose, the restoration of true church communion and life. Wherever Luther followed the free flight of his genius, he opposed every hierarchical form of the communication of salvation and the ownership of conscience so overpoweringly that the impact from his convictions and the force of his thought shook the papal chair to its very foundation. He said: "All Christians have a true spiritual order, and there is no difference between them." "Baptism, the Gospel, and Faith make a spiritually-minded and Christian people." "The special spiritual standing of Pope, Bishops, Priests, and Monastic orders is an invention." "All Christians are taught by God." Utterances like these were blows which fell with shivering force upon the three "walls" of the Roman Church: first, the supremacy of the spiritual power over the civil; second, the supremacy of the Pope over the Council and the laity; and lastly, the exclusive right of the Hierarchy to interpret Holy Scripture.

## IV

## SCHENKEL'S INTERPRETATION OF PROTESTANTISM

SCHENKEL maintains that fundamentally the Evangelical Church is a living communion of its members with God, and the mission of Protestantism fearlessly to antagonize all dead hierarchical ecclesiasticism within and without. The restoration of mankind to such a living communion with God is alone possible through faith in Jesus Christ. By this is meant the form of faith which is the antithesis of the work of righteousness of Roman Catholicism. When one recognizes Jesus Christ, the God-man, or Son of God, to be the object of evangelical faith, one opposes that conception of faith made prominent in the *Catechismus Romanus,* which defines faith to be obedient submission to the authority of ecclesiastical tradition. If Jesus Christ is the fundamental object of evangelical faith, and also the object of Scripture, then it is impossible to separate faith in the Lord from faith in the Scriptures. Schenkel contends that Protestantism in essence is not a prescribed ecclesiastical faith, but that, free from churchly tradition, it ever, through the agency of the Spirit and its inherent church-organizing power, goes back to its original norm of truth, the divinely authenticated revelation in Christ. Holy Scripture is the

norm for the unfolding and presentation of doctrine, but not for the free believing acceptance of salvation. Hundreds and thousands were converted to Christ by the preaching of the Gospel before the canon of Holy Scripture was authorized by the Church, and before the doctrine of the normative authority of the Scriptures had received symbolical authority anywhere in the Christian Church. He is not satisfied with the definition given by Gass in his *History of Protestant Dogmatics in Relation to Theology in General,* namely, that the principle of Protestantism is its soul, which manifests itself "in the auto-activity of the historical subject," an explanation which is inadequate and without foundation. Gass describes Protestantism in general as the freer vindication of the same needs of, and the same claims to, the highest good, upon the holiest grounds of conscience, and "churchly" Protestantism as "the free appropriation of Christian salvation from the standpoint of faith in Christ, the only Healer and Redeemer of the world, revealed by the free grace of God, according to the norm of Holy Scripture." But this tells us nothing about the "soul" of Protestantism, and entirely omits the moment of communion, or the mystical fellowship of believers. Is not Christian salvation appropriated through faith, rather than from the "standpoint of faith"? Does this appropriation occur "according to the norm of Holy Scripture," instead of coming through the influence of the Holy Spirit?

Schenkel reiterates and defends the definition of Protestantism which he gives in his larger work, *The*

*Essence of Protestantism,* namely, that it is nothing else than the most perfect historical manifestation of Christianity we possess since the Apostolic Age. He begins the above-named work with the words: "The essence of Protestantism is the true essence of Christianity." He feels convinced that the definition he has given of the principle of Protestantism is free from all artificial and abstract ideas, and describes the simple fact of experience, that Protestantism, through the awakening of conscience and the deepening of faith, through earnest ethico-religious personal activity, strives in Jesus Christ to lead mankind back to communion with God, and aims thus to restore men in fact and reality from the condition of ruin wrought by sin and guilt. Therefore Protestantism must oppose and battle against everything that is interposed to injure and that has a tendency to defeat this sublime purpose. Therefore it is the sworn enemy of all mediatory ecclesiasticism, all hierarchical government, all pretensions to clerical, doctrinal, confessional, and cultus domination, and every conception of the ministry as a special order, instituted to exercise spiritual guardianship over the laity.

Protestantism seeks to accomplish the regeneration of the individual, and to realize a Church of the regenerate. Hence the visible Church possesses divine sanction and worth only to the degree in which it has regenerating power and numbers converted members, without denying the profound truth contained in the declaration that, where the Word of God is preached in its purity and the sacraments are regularly administered, regenerated Christians and members of the

true Church, the Church of the First-Born, will not be wanting. In answer to the objection offered by Sudhoff that this position makes the sacraments the instruments of faith, Schenkel stated that he was wrongly quoted; that he did not say the function of the sacraments was none other than to work faith, but that where faith does not exist, to awaken it, and where it is, to aid and strengthen it, and that he aimed to counteract the subjectivism which appears here and there in the Reformed Church, based upon the idea that the sacraments have worth only in proportion to the weakness or strength of the faith of the recipient. All Reformed confessions agree that the sacraments are aids to faith, and according to the *Heidelberg Catechism,* question sixty-seven, both the Word and the Sacraments direct our faith to the Sacrifice of Christ upon the cross as the only ground of our salvation. According to the old Protestant view of Luther and his followers the sacrament is as efficient as the Word. If the sacrament strengthens faith, why should it not also awaken it? Hence it follows that the unworthy recipient eats and drinks judgment unto himself. A wholesome, humble sense of uncertainty, or doubt, will profit by the sacrament; but an overbearing self-sufficient, self-righteous faith obtains no benefit from the use of it. Schenkel admits that a number of factors combined to give birth to Protestantism. He contends, however, that these are not principles, and must be differentiated from the fundamental impelling power which determined the unity of the great historic movement. This unity of essence and spirit prevents the ultimate dismemberment of

Protestantism, but does not hinder the rise of a variety of tendencies and manifold, even irregular, or sectarian forms of expression in history, self-explanatory in origin, possessing distinct individualization, and yet grounded in the substantial fulness of the one and only truth.

Similar manifestations occurred in earlier periods in the history of Christianity, and were shaped by other conditions. Factors are individualizing moments in some great movement in the life of the world, and are secondary to a principle, which in origin is something creative, and not a resultant. Therefore Schenkel, who claims to have conclusively proved his loyalty to the Old Church dogmas and symbols, insists that Holy Scripture is not a principle of Protestantism. He holds that it is the normal archetype of the manifestation of the divine redemptive Revelation itself. To separate oneself from Scripture would amount to a severance from the archetype of the divine redemptive Revelation itself, and therefore the Roman Catholic Church does not dare to contradict Holy Scripture in a single point, and cannot vindicate doctrinal tradition in any other sense than by preserving the organic unity of oral and written tradition. Hence in the last analysis it all depends upon the interpretation of Scripture, and indeed upon the hermeneutical rules in force, and these are conditioned upon, and determined by, the fundamental confessional principles. Undoubtedly one who holds the highest principle to be the restoration of mankind through faith in Jesus Christ to an ethically perfect communion with God will unquestionably interpret

Scripture differently from one who has chosen as his principal point of departure the establishment of an outward hierarchical ecclesiastical institution, whose function shall be to dispense salvation mediatorially in an altogether exclusive manner. On both sides the Scriptures are not a principle, because even the normative Church authority is established by the confessional differences which determine and fix the fundamental principle of interpretation.

In conclusion Schenkel acknowledges the great value of the criticism received from his honoured and learned friend, Dr. Hagenbach, as a contribution to the extensive literature upon the subject under discussion, and adds that he never would have undertaken the task of presenting a different view of Protestantism, were he not standing upon the shoulders of his predecessors, and had he not for many years investigated the subject, and specialized in a rather thorough study of the original writings and documentary evidence of the sixteenth century. He expresses the conviction that should his learned friend fail to endorse his analysis as a whole, he will agree with him in one point, namely, that the world-historical mission of Protestantism does not point toward confessional division and tension, but to union and reunion, to the gathering of one flock under one Shepherd, which, also according to his, Hagenbach's, own view, must be consummated before the mission of Protestantism shall have been fulfilled.

In conclusion Schenkel follows Hagenbach's example by giving a summary of his argument:

I. The Reformation of the sixteenth century origi-

nated from the coöperation or confluence of a number of different factors, but according to its innermost essence from *one principle,* that is to say, it arose from a fundamental religio-moral aspiration, or effort, in which at the same time opposition to the old order was included.

II. This opposition not only affected the means of grace, but also involved the inquiry into the facts of redemption themselves, that is to say, not only the question *how* the vicarious sacrifice of Christ on the cross is appropriated by us in absolute sufficiency, but the question whether this sacrifice needs to be perpetuated through the Mass, or whether it is fully adequate in itself. Hence it is incorrect to seek for the motive of the opposition between Protestantism and Catholicism entirely or even only predominatingly in, or to limit it to, the anthropological or subjective side.

III. The supposition that in the subjective field Protestantism and Catholicism are at variance concerning true faith and good works, the authority of the Scriptures and the arbitrary traditions of men, is modified by the fact that Catholicism also highly esteems "faith in the Scriptures," teaches that the former is necessary for the appropriation of salvation, and the latter divinely authorized and binding upon the Church. The real contradiction lies in this fact, that Catholicism holds *faith* to be the Church's faith, and not personal faith, and that the Scriptures are subject to the interpretation of the Church, and forbids private study of the Bible to the faithful. To say the least, the reading of the Bible privately has

not been encouraged in more enlightened communities. The authority of the Church and the authority of faith constitute the essential difference in the subjective realm between Protestantism and Catholicism.

IV. Since Protestantism bases the salvation of souls upon the only and eternally sufficient atoning sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, the objective side, and this salvation is mediated and appropriated only through the ethical act of personal faith, the subjective side, it rejects the hierarchy, which makes salvation dependent upon a visible and externally organized priestly establishment, supposedly ordained of God, and aims in contradiction thereto to restore mankind to a morally perfect living communion with God through faith in Jesus Christ, the God-man.

V. This ethical restorative or regenerative energy of Protestantism, which by auto-faith grasps the salvation mediated by Christ alone and realizes a community of living believers who have entered into vital fellowship with God, and which shall ultimately embrace the whole human family, is the unitary fundamental impulse of Protestantism by which alone it can be fully understood in its manifold manifestations and tendencies.

VI. The so-called formal principle, or Holy Scripture, is the norm of all doctrinal development and presentation on the churchly side of Protestantism. Hence the Scriptures are the original criterion by which the whole doctrinal content of the Evangelical Protestant Church must be measured and tried, but not the principle itself, or the living immanent fundamental impulse or impelling power of Protestantism.

The so-called material principle, or the doctrine of justification, is an important dogma of Protestantism, but it is not the fundamental motive itself from which Protestantism arose nor through which it continues to maintain and perpetuate itself.

VII. The confessional differences between Reformed and Lutheran Protestants are best relieved from historical and dogmatical antagonism and tension by being guided back to the unity of the fundamental principle of Protestantism. The historico-scientific effort to understand the essence of Protestantism in its deepest and most inner principle originated from an altogether practical necessity, that of *union,* and general union is possible only then when the unitary principle has relegated the points of difference to their own place of secondary importance, and has removed from them the appearance of primacy.

VIII. Then it will be shown ever more clearly that Protestantism in essence is nothing else than the true and complete realization of Christianity itself; that the principle of Protestantism is identical with the essence of Christianity, though differing in form and expression, and that Evangelical Protestant Catholicity, which has never ceased to lay claim to the testimony of our faith, inherited from the sixteenth century, is the very Catholicity destined by faith in Jesus Christ, the God-man, to bring mankind nearer and nearer together in a morally complete communion with God as one flock under one Shepherd.

As can readily be seen, in a conflict like this between two vast world movements in human history,

thought and feeling easily fly from one extreme to another. The *opus operatum* plan of religion presented and so long contended for by the Roman Catholic Church gives such undue prominence to the objective means of grace, held to be the possession of the Church, and to be administered by her only, that thereby the moral and spiritual initiative of the individual is weakened beyond all reason and in contradiction of Holy Scripture: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." On the Evangelical Protestant side the subjective element and prerogative in religion are often pressed to such an extreme that the individual believer considers himself to be the sole arbiter and administrator in the realm of faith. In the former case we witness the manifestation of priestly administration, laic passivity, ownership of conscience, and church tyranny. In the latter case the Church, as the witness of Gospel truth, divinely instituted by Christ, ceases to have any solidarity and visible authority at all any longer among men, and divinely authenticated Revelation becomes the bagatelle of individual opinion, whim, and caprice. Without scriptural and properly authenticated safeguards, subjectivism ends in egotism and pharisaic pride.

## V

## SCHENKEL AND VON HURTER

THE ardour with which Dr. Schenkel defended and promulgated his Protestant views and convictions is no doubt to be accounted for in part by an important event early in his public life. Following his graduation from Heidelberg University, in the Palatinate, he became the successor, in 1841, of Frederic Emmanuel von Hurter, senior pastor at the Minster in Schaffhausen, in Switzerland, dean of the synod, and author of a famous biography of Pope Innocent III. He was the son of pious Protestant parents, who belonged to the Reformed Church, but as the result of uncongenial conditions around him, he accepted Roman Catholicism and in 1844 entered the Catholic Church. Because of his prominence in the Reformed Church in Switzerland, his conversion to Roman Catholicism aroused deep regret and much bitterness among his former co-religionists.

Von Hurter believed in stability. Both in matters of religion and affairs of state he was an ultra-conservative. The political changes in Switzerland displeased him. It was distasteful and repugnant to him to witness the usurpation of the functions of the Church by the civil power, and the elimination of the former from the field of education. For ten years he fought against these threatened and approaching

changes, before the new order of conditions was consummated. The Reformed teachings had been adopted in 1530 in the canton and city of Schaffhausen, where he was born, and he could not accustom himself to the thought that a further step was about to be taken, this time in the direction of free thought and personal independence, to the injury of fundamental Christian faith.

During the closing days of 1830 emissaries from other cantons, with the help of local confederates, won most of the rural churches away from the established system of political and social life. It was impossible for the authorities to stem the tide of revolution. The people demanded constitutional changes, a legislature, as in other cantons, and a separation between federal and municipal property.* It could readily be seen that the revolution would affect all the relations of society. Von Hurter wrote a pamphlet in which he expressed his conviction that the true minister of the Gospel is consciously the bearer and herald of an unchangeable Revelation, and must recognize in it the bulwark and defence against all the attacks of revolutionary sentiment and organization. The Church also in essence and aim remains unalterable, though everything earthly should be resolved into an endless flux and flow. Upon this tide, interpreted as the only normally beneficial state of things, and into this tumult, the Church looks down with calmness from her serene and happy height.† By his stern opposition he aroused enmity against himself

* Von Hurter, *Geburt und Wiedergeburt,* Vol. I, p. 257.

† Von Hurter, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 270.

among the citizens. In popular elections he saw the lever of unrest and anarchy, the ready means for the periodical and capricious reversal of civic and official oaths. He inveighed against the method from the pulpit. He opposed it in the council chamber. He began to look upon the struggle and contention, the conflict of ideas and the rivalry of candidates, as a token of the decay and disintegration of Protestantism. The first constitutional amendment which was introduced for passage in the new assembly excluded the clergy from the use of the ballot. The Board of Control consisted of eleven members, of whom only three were ministers of the Gospel. This minority representation dated from the time when the civil power began to regulate and administer both church government and church doctrine.* Nevertheless, some years later, after the death of the pliable incumbent who had defeated him in a former contest, he was elected to the position of Antistes or Protestant bishop.

Von Hurter, tracing his ancestry back to the nobility, possessed great family pride. For this reason his sentiments were aristocratic, and he dreaded the encroachments of Swiss democracy. His mind began to revert to the past, and he recalled the fact that before the days of the Reformation his ancestors were devout members of the Roman Communion. In the midst of these conflicts in Church and State, he devoted twenty years of research and labour to the writing of the biography of Pope Innocent III and the history of his time. Von Hurter's conservatism,

* Von Hurter, *Geburt und Wiedergeburt*, Vol. I, p. 272.

and his growing friendliness toward the Roman Catholic Church embittered still more all parties among the Protestants. This work, in four volumes, is probably the greatest biography of Innocent III which has ever been written. It was translated into Italian and French during the lifetime of the author, and at once made him famous throughout the Catholic world, more especially because of its unprejudiced character, irenical spirit, historic faithfulness, and exhaustive treatment. The rare picture of Pope Innocent III, in the first volume of the biography, is a copy from a miniature found in the family of the Conti, in Rome, and carefully authenticated after long and patient research.

The disturbance in matters of faith, in Schaffhausen, as well as in other Swiss cantons at this juncture, in part grew out of the Hegelian philosophy, and the Mythical Theory of Strauss, set forth in his *Leben Jesu*. The Mythical Theory destroys the historic authenticity of the tradition of the Virgin Birth, and Von Hurter grieved over the attack which was thus made upon the historic foundations of Christianity. This is what he says: "That mystery which all Christian confessions accept, in company with the Apostles' Creed, is the Incarnation. With this event Christianity stands or falls as Divine Revelation and as world salvation. I am not speaking of those Protestants who protest against Divine Revelation itself, but of those believing Protestants who do not doubt that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, that is to say, the Virgin who said to the angel: 'How shall this be, seeing I know not a

man?'* This mystery is taught in the catechisms, is preached from the pulpits, and lies at the very foundation of all faith. Without it, Jesus might still be the Founder of Christianity, but could not be the Saviour of the world." † From this mystery he reasons to the daily miracle of the real presence of Christ in the sacrifice of the Mass, and tries to throw light upon the path by which he conquered the greatest obstacle that confronted him in his transition to the Roman Catholic Church. In the effort he made to change his faith, he found it to be almost impossible for him, as he himself confesses, to accept the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

The *Heidelberg Catechism* was the text-book in Christianity in the gymnasium and in all the schools of the canton. Faculty and teachers stood firmly upon fundamental principles, but through misrepresentation and charges of dead orthodoxy the effort was made to eliminate the catechism from public instruction. Von Hurter says that he taught the *Heidelberg Catechism* for twenty years; that it became dearer and dearer to him every year, and that he found the fundamental teachings of Christianity set forth in it clearly, concisely, and logically. He defended it in a little book entitled, *Methods of Education in a Republic,* and expressed the following view: "When a Reformed commonwealth has the good fortune to possess the *Heidelberg Catechism* as a text-book in religion, it cannot resist too watchfully the elimination of this work as antiquated, unsuitable, and outworn. Only

* St. Luke 1:34.

† Von Hurter, *Geburt und Wiedergeburt,* Vol. III, p. 8.

those who lack understanding claim to possess superior enlightenment, and are engaged in the ungrateful task of taking away from Christianity all that is distinguishing in, peculiar, and essential to it, make this the subject of their declamatory denunciations. This worthy, firm, and powerful bulwark of the Church's defence is an abomination to them, and they would rather in its stead have a turned, carved, and polished bit of wood, which also in case of necessity might be bent." * He asserts that had he not so strenuously defended the use of the catechism as a representative symbol of the most important branch of instruction, religion itself, it would long before his time have been dropped from the schools, and the subject of which it treats left to the subjective bias of the individual teacher. All who found in the catechism only a negative Protestantism have simply failed to discover the positive elements of truth it contains. He says for example that he never concealed his view of the " inglorious " eightieth question, but expressed the opinion that if in the future such words as these should prove to be necessary, they must not be directed against those who worship the Godhead of Christ under the form of bread and wine, but rather against those who deny it altogether, or desire to condemn it by reason of their enlightenment. In like manner concerning the thirtieth question of the catechism he declared that the Catholic Church never and nowhere has taught that salvation is to be sought through the saints.†

* Von Hurter, *Geburt und Wiedergeburt,* Vol. I, p. 221.
† Von Hurter, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 223.

Long before these things came to pass, Von Hurter, in 1814, began to write the *History of Pope Innocent the Third and His Contemporaries.* Walking aimlessly back and forth in his study one day, in that year, in search of a special literary task to occupy some spare moments in a period of leisure, his eyes fell upon a two-volume edition of the *Letters of Innocent the Third,* which had been published in Göttingen. In all his activity as a student, he had never been interested in the Middle Ages, and Innocent III he knew only by name. He took down the first volume, and on opening it, his attention was immediately arrested by the chapter entitled: "Gesta Innocentii." Thus by accident, apparently, a field of investigation and literary labour unfolded before his view, which he cultivated for twenty years. The remarkable personality of Pope Innocent III, the great number of his notable achievements, and the heights of grandeur to which he guided the Church of Rome, awakened Von Hurter's wonder, and captivated his imagination. The sheer vastness of the design overwhelmed him, and the task itself influenced him more profoundly than any one other experience in his life.* Von Hurter belonged to the Romantic period of German literature, and was caught by the drift to Rome, which carried Frederic Schlegel, Adam Müller, Zacharias Werner, and other gifted men, as well as women, into the Catholic Church, through a mystical and poetic veneration for "the ages of faith in miracles," the sacred art of Medievalism, the music of the Minnesingers, the Volksong, the tales and legends, and the

*Von Hurter, *Geburt und Wiedergeburt,* Vol. I, p. 203.

chivalry, whose living, objective world has passed away, never again to be revived. Those men who opposed the movement of enlightenment, the broad interpretation of Christianity made by Schiller and Goethe, and hated the revolutionary trend in Germany, sought refuge and comfort in the thought, the world view, the mystery, miracle, worship, and incense of the Middle Ages.

## VI

## VON HURTER AND THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION

VON HURTER acknowledges that when one has been born and educated, and has grown old in Protestantism, it seems difficult and almost impossible to accept the mystery of Transubstantiation in the sacrifice of the Mass. This is the rock of greatest offence, the obstacle hardest to overcome. A Catholic, so born and reared, naturally wonders at this feeling of aversion and revolt among Protestants in relation to the Mass. He would understand this attitude of mind better, Von Hurter asserts, could he obtain only a passing insight into the view of the Lord's Supper taught, promulgated, and maintained among Protestants, especially among the followers of Zwingli and Calvin. These words seem to possess all the force of an admission, even after his determination to enter the Roman Catholic Church had been consummated, that the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper is Biblical, and therefore more binding than any other to the conscience. Von Hurter says that he remained in doubt and greatly troubled concerning the doctrine of Transubstantiation until he read the dissertation by Pope Innocent III on that subject. The condemnation pronounced by Von Hurter upon Protestantism in Schaffhausen sounds

more like a betrayal of his own inner religious Evangelical convictions than like a true representation of actual fact. Evidently it was not the content of the *Heidelberg Catechism* itself which worked the ruin and desolation of which he complains, in the religious life of Schaffhausen, for the *Heidelberg Catechism* retains the article of, and confesses faith in, the Virgin Birth of our Lord, and in all the miracles of early Christianity, elemental to its establishment from the Godward side of Revelation, in harmony with the New Testament. The reintroduction of the old form of religion and worship would not have remedied the situation. Dead Protestant orthodoxy is about as bad as dead Roman Catholic orthodoxy. The cause of the evil did not, and does not, lie in the content of the great Protestant confessions, nor altogether in the didactic, formal, and mechanical methods of instruction, but in the dissemination of false philosophy, arrogant scientific opinionatedness, and spiritual starvation, and above all in the failure to cultivate and perpetuate a living faith in Christ in the individual believer, through a change of heart, and by the entrance and indwelling of the Spirit. "The letter killeth, but the spirit it is that giveth life."

Pope Innocent III defines and argues in defence of the Mass as follows: "When the priest pronounces the words: 'This is my body, this is my blood,' the bread and wine are transmuted into the body and blood of Christ through the power of that Word by which the 'Word became flesh and dwells among us'; through which He transmuted a woman into a pillar and a staff into a serpent; the well into blood, and water into

wine. If the word of Elijah could call fire from Heaven, why should not the word of Christ convert bread into flesh? Who would dare to expect such a thing from Him 'to whom all things are possible, and without whom nothing was made that is made.' It is unquestionably greater to create what did not exist before than to transmute something which already exists, and it is infinitely more wonderful to call forth something from nothing than to convert one thing into another thing. No one doubts the former. Why should any one doubt the latter? By no means. It is incomparably greater that God became man after a manner in which He did not cease to be God, than that bread becomes flesh in such a way as to cease to be bread. The former occurred only once through the Incarnation. The latter takes place continually through the consecration. Some one may say: 'I am indeed certain that the Word has that power, but I am not convinced that He wills the latter.' Let such an one be well assured that when He took bread, it was Christ who blessed it, and said: 'This is my body.' The Truth spoke in this way, and hence what was thus said must be unquestionably true. That which was bread when He took it, was His body when He gave it to His disciples. Thus the bread was transmuted into His own body and the wine into His own blood. When our Lord said: 'This is my body,' the words must not be understood as if He had said, according to the explanation of the heretics, 'This symbolizes my body.' The words are to be taken in this sense as little as the Apostle is to be understood to teach that the Rock signifies Christ when he says:

'But the Rock is Christ.'* He would more likely have said this concerning the Paschal Lamb than of the unleavened bread, for without doubt the Paschal Lamb typified the body of Christ, but the unleavened bread was a thing of truth and reality.

"In like manner John the Baptist said: 'Behold the Lamb of God,' but gave definite meaning to his words by adding: 'that taketh away the sins of the world.' So Christ also explained the words: 'This is my body,' still further, with the modifying clause: 'which was broken for you.' As, therefore, the body of Christ was in truth offered up, so it was also called *true,* and not presented as a figure which had passed away, but as the *Truth* which had in reality come. Moreover, when the Jews disputed among one another and said: 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' Jesus answered them by saying: 'Verily, verily, I say, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.' For this reason He said: 'Amen, amen,' verily, verily, that the words, 'Except ye eat my flesh' might not be understood figuratively, but literally and in truth. And to express the truth still more explicitly He added: 'For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.' Hence I also, who long to receive eternal life, eat the true flesh and drink His true blood, the flesh, namely, which He took upon Himself from the Virgin, and the blood which He spilled upon the cross. I believe in my heart and confess with my lips that in this sacra-

*I Corinthians 10:4. "And the Rock was the Christ" is the literal wording of the passage: ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ χριστός.

ment I receive our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, resting, as I do, upon His words: 'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me.'* "

Von Hurter further explains that besides this another observation helped him. He recognized the fact that the Protestants, those who are true to the fundamental teachings which Luther, also Calvin and others, accepted unwaveringly and in all earnestness, do not raise the least doubt concerning a mystery which can be measured by the measuring rod of the human reason as little as the mystery of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar, and which equally with the latter transcends the grasp of human thought. The difference between the two lies only in this, that the former is limited to a single event and offered from the distant past for acceptation to the believer, whereas the latter renews itself daily, in every place, in the presence of every one. Concerning this doctrine one may make the answer which has often been given to those who doubt the possibility of any miracle at all, namely, that if we are compelled to admit but one single miracle, the question whether there are few or many miracles becomes of secondary importance. The miracle Von Hurter had in mind is the Miraculous Conception and Virgin Birth of Jesus, which he firmly and unflinchingly declares to be the foundation-stone of the Christian religion.

A second reason assigned by him to explain his final acceptance of the dogma of Transubstantiation is the orthodox Protestant recognition of the mystical presence of our Lord in the Holy Supper, as confessionally

* St. John 6:57.

held especially by the Lutherans. In this manner, therefore, he taught himself to lend assent to the dogmatic statement concerning the so-called sacrifice of the Mass, which was made by Pope Innocent III in the thirteenth century.

It seems strange that Von Hurter ignored the inconsistency manifest in the argument of the greatest of the Popes in defence of Transubstantiation, and the confused current of his reasoning. Pope Innocent simply assumes that a priest, because of his consecration to the ministry of the altar, possesses the power to work a miracle in the Mass by uttering the words of sacramental institution, but this premise, this idea of the priesthood, remains veiled and in the background. It does not folllow that because God changed Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, and Jesus, His eternal Son, transmuted water into wine, any one of His chosen followers in the Church of the New Covenant can exercise a creative prerogative which belongs to God alone, nor that it is necessary so to interpret the Holy Supper as to make possible a spiritual communion with the risen, glorified, and ascended Master only and alone by associating a transubstantiation, or even a consubstantiation, in the hypermaterialization of the transcendent, visibly absent Christ, through the creative mediation and exclusive intervention of the special ambassadors of Jesus on earth, raised beyond all warrant in Scripture to a special miracle-working ministry, *opus operatum*. The sacrament, we know, is the visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted by Jesus Christ. But it is the outward sign taken symbolically, and not essentially. The essence it repre-

sents is invisible and spiritual, altogether the gift of God, and beyond the command of men. We do not deny that God's minister locks and unlocks the treasures of Heaven. We maintain that a usurpation of authority and power not taught in the Scriptures and never vested in any order of men by Christ is mythical and meaningless, defeating the plan, and disrupting the Kingdom of God in Jesus Christ. Therefore the dogmatic view that in the Holy Eucharist the sacrifice of Christ is repeated daily by the priests must be eliminated from the ceremonial service of the Church, as was done in England during the reign of King Edward VI, in consonance with the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Christ entered the Holy of Holies once and for all, even Heaven itself, where He maketh intercession for us." This is virtually done by the Modernists, who, while they retain the old form and symbolism, breathe into it a new meaning and spirit, in keeping with historic, Primitive Christianity, by a return to the *Agape,* or feast of brotherly love in Christ.

The doctrine of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, as enunciated by Pope Innocent III, was dogmatically propounded and proclaimed for the first time in the history of Christianity in the year 831, as far as any existing records show, by Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corbey, and this, because he became the first pronounced apologist and exponent of an interpretation of the Lord's Supper which already existed in the minds of many Christian believers, makes him virtually the father of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. In his *Liber de Sacramento*

*Corporis et Sanguinis Domini* he says: "No one who believes in the Word of God can deny that through the consecration the real body and blood arise. Jesus declares that His flesh is meat indeed and that His blood is drink indeed. But since one cannot eat Christ with the teeth, He has so arranged it that the bread and the wine in the sacrament are transmuted by the Holy Ghost as to power into His flesh and His blood, and thereby daily offered up mystically for the life of the world, just as the Holy Ghost created a true body in the womb of the Virgin without the presence of a man. Thus, too, from the substance of bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are mystically prepared." *

The reigning controversy on this subject became aggravated and more extended through the writings of Paschasius Radbertus, who, in company with Rabanus Maurus, was answered by Ratramnus Maurus, also a monk in the Monastery of Corbey, and John Scotus Erigena, a liberal thinker, at the behest of Charles the Bald. This conflict developed the three leading views of the Lord's Supper, the radical objective doctrine of Radbertus, the milder teaching of Rabanus Maurus, and those who wished to retain the Real Presence in, with, and under the elements after consecration, and the higher, spiritual interpretation of Ratramnus Maurus. This doctrinal conflict was waged far into the tenth century, when the more spiritual teaching finally yielded to the rising tide of sentiment and training in favour of the priestly miracle of the Mass, though the differences in the in-

* C. F. Rössler, *Die Kirchen-Vaeter,* Vol. X, p. 621.

terpretation of the Holy Eucharist never yet have reached a satisfactory and final solution. The conflict began anew, with greater severity than ever, through the Revival of Learning and the Reformation, when the Papacy, with its doctrine of the Mass, for the most part inherited from Paschasius Radbertus and Pope Innocent III, was confronted on the one hand by Luther and his followers, who with their doctrine of Ubiquity were in a sense the sixteenth century disciples of Rabanus Maurus and Scotus Erigena and on the other by the Swiss and Genevan Reformers, Zwingli and Calvin, who, with some important modifications, revived the doctrine of Ratramnus Maurus. The view of Ratramnus is, that, as the divine Word dwells in the natural body of Christ, so it unites with the bread and wine, and therefore both as the vehicle of the communication of the divine Logos or the spiritual communion with Christ are in a figurative sense called the body of Christ. Bread and wine after the consecration act upon the minds of believers with an effect they could not produce under ordinary circumstances. Believers become conscious at the celebration of the Holy Supper of a spiritual communion with Christ, or the communication of the divine Logos. Ratramnus ascribes this influence to the objective elements. In this sense he speaks of a *conversio* of the bread and wine into the body of Christ. At the same time he says in this connection, that what appears to be external is not the thing itself, but only a picture or figure of it; that what the soul feels and receives into consciousness is the truth the thing represents, and that it is the Word, the Logos,

which feeds and nourishes the soul. A great many declare, he continues, that the Holy Supper is not figurative, but truth itself.

Herein, however, they contradict the early Fathers, especially Augustine, who does not recognize any physical eating of the body of Christ. He distinguishes between sacraments and the things whose sacraments they are.* The body in which the Lord suffered, and His blood which flowed from His side, are things. The mysteries of these things he calls sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which are celebrated in memory of the sufferings of the Lord, not only at the annual paschal season, but every day throughout the year. Some ask whether it is the same body which Mary bore, which suffered, and now sitteth at the right hand of the Father, that the believer receives with his mouth at the daily service of the Church, through the mystery of the sacrament. If we consult St. Ambrosius concerning this question, we find that he does not understand thereby any such physical eating of the same body, nor any such degenerative change in the sacrament. In substance the emblems are not changed by the act of consecration. They were bread and wine before, and they remain such afterward. Hence the bread, which is called the body of Christ, and the wine, which is called the

* During this period, the ninth century, the Greek Church exhibited a tendency to multiply the sacraments. This was not then the case in the Western Church. Rabanus Maurus and Paschasius Radbertus recognize four sacraments, Baptism and its Charism, and the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. However, in reality there are only two sacraments here. See further: Hagenbach, *Dogmengeschichte,* Vol. II, p. 150.

blood of Christ, is a symbol, a figure, because it is a mystery, and is a figure not only of Christ's own body, but also of the body of believers. Moreover, it is a remembrance, a representative commemoration of the suffering and death of the Lord. Jesus Himself at the institution of the Supper, and Paul later on, in I Corinthians 2, teach us that bread and wine, which are placed upon the altar, are put there as a figure, or memorial of the death of Christ. The Word of God which dwells in an unseen manner in the sacrament, in an invisible manner gives life and nourishment to the souls of believers by means of communion with Christ.

Neander says that the view of Paschasius Radbertus is the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass which the Roman Catholic Church has held and inculcated ever since the time of Gregory the Great.* Ratramnus Maurus, on the other hand, describes the Supper as a memorial of the sacrifice of Christ, through the commemoration of which preparation is made to receive the divine grace of salvation. "Once we shall have attained the vision of Christ," Ratramnus concludes, "we will not need such instrumentalities any longer to remind us of the suffering of infinite Mercy for our sake. We shall see Him face to face, and will have ceased to require external, temporal things to awaken our hearts and aid our thoughts. Through the immediate contemplation of the Truth we will pour out unending thankfulness to the Author of our salvation." †

* Neander, *Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. II, p. 274.
† Rössler, *Kirchen-Vaeter,* Vol. X, p. 651.

The conflict extended far into the tenth century, and the more consistently Biblical and spiritual view of Ratramnus was gradually, but surely, pressed into the background as heretical, because of the overwhelming current in the opposite direction, by, and in spite of, the formidable and widespread protest against the doctrine of Paschasius Radbertus, who seemed, with his terminology, to try to explain the incomprehensible. Herigar, abbot of the monastery of Laubes, in the Province of Lüttich, or Luxemburg, at the end of the tenth century, without expressing his own view of the Lord's Supper, wrote a book composed of citations from the Church Fathers, to prove that Paschasius Radbertus did not agree with them in his teaching. In a history of the abbots of that monastery it is said of him: Congressit contra Radbertum multa catholicorum patrum scripta de corpore et sanguine Domini.

In this same period Pope Nicholas II, who increased the temporal power of the Papacy, did not favour the doctrine of Transubstantiation. In a letter to the Emperor Michael (*Harduin, V,* fol. 125), he says that the bread which is used is common bread, but after it has been sanctified it becomes, and in truth is called, the body of Christ. So also the wine, which possesses ordinary value before the benediction, is sanctified thereby, and the spirit and blood of Christ follow from the blessing.*

* "Panis, qui offertur, panis est quidem communis, sed quando ipse sacramento sacratus fuerit, corpus Christi in veritate fit et dicitur. Sic et vinum modicæ aliquid dignitatis existens ante benedictionem, post sanctificationem spiritus et sanguis Christi efficitur."—Neander, *Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. II, p. 275.

## VII

## THE PORTRAIT OF THE MIDDLE AGES

VON HURTER has painted a magnificent word-picture of the character and spirit of the Middle Ages.* Two reigning intellectual forces moved with mighty influence through the life of Christendom during that period of European history. The first was faith in extraordinary interpositions of divine power in human affairs, and the second was the fixed collective impression that every calamity which befell both individuals and communities displayed the retributive justice of God as a penalty for sins committed in the past. Men were not satisfied with faith in an unapproachable God, who, though guiding all things, yet kept Himself hidden from human knowledge. He was to be everywhere manifestly present. He was to reveal Himself everywhere; here in His glory, there in the realization of His purposes; helpful to the pious in the attainment of some chosen and earnestly desired goal in life; meting out to the sinner self-knowledge, repentance, and betterment, to the scoffer contrition, to the profligate punishment, to thousands overwhelming examples for warning or instruction, in unexpected and astonishing departures from the even tenor of things. Nearly all the writers of this age treat of events of

* Von Hurter, *Geschichte Innocenz des Dritten,* Vol. IV, p. 505.

Frederic von Hurter

this kind. Some of them collected accounts of strange occurrences from various sources, and wrote them down, as, for example: Peter Venerabilis de Miraculis sui temporis, in *Marrier Biblia.* All this is simply evidence of the profound depth to which faith in miracles had penetrated into life. The multitude believed in the appearance of saints, the exorcism and banishment of devils, the awakening, conversion, and liberation of souls from the clutches of Satan, wonderful deliverances from assailments upon chastity; other temptations and their vanquishment; prophecies, the influence of relics, reawakenings from the dead, unusual recoveries of health, revelations, the discovery of the bodies of saints and the marvels at their reinterment, ecstasies, miraculous growth of flour and bread, when abbots fed the multitude, unusual quenching of the thirst of the armies sent out by Innocent III in the crusade against the Albigenses, the appearance of spirits, then of crosses, and other sacred symbols in the sky, upon the sides of churches, and the walls of beleaguered cities, the pleasant odour of the bodies of the sainted dead who had fallen in battle against the heretics, the indestructibility by fire of Catholic corpses in the power of heretics, and immunity from death under the sign of the cross. One readily recognizes the element of the fabulous in many of these tales and stories. And yet even the most searching criticism of our own time cannot by mere denial, or by the charge of fanaticism, explain some of the remarkable occurrences in those periods of history, as, for example, the healing of many sick persons, during the journeys of St. Bernard along the Rhine. No

matter how one may choose to interpret such phenomena and records, one truth lies undeniably underneath the whole of that world of wonder, and it is this, that thousands upon thousands must have been influenced in their lives thereby, and many Christian hearts must have been awakened, guided, and protected by its influence. We may call this the mysterious higher world of the eternal Spirit made manifest through the thin veil of sense. This conviction of the reality of the unseen was unquestioned and overpowering alike to the just and the unjust. Therefore the people of that age found no difficulty in believing any report which passed from one country to another, that a departed knight had returned to life and had in one place told of the pangs of the damned, and in another of the suffering of poor souls in purgatory.

They viewed the natural world in the same way. Unusual submergence in the extraordinary, superhuman, supernatural, mysterious, mystical, childish, and inane, characterized their relation to Nature, but after all there shines through it the light of a higher world, and the recognition and worship of an all-encompassing, everywhere-present, Almighty Power. Montalembert says (p. 98): "La moindre petite legende Catholique a gagné plus de cœurs a ces immortelles verités que toutes les dissertations des philosophes." All the relations of daily life, even the most trivial acts and things, were so thoroughly suffused with this atmosphere of wonder that everywhere the manifestations of the elements and of the forces of Nature were solemnly associated with the

unseen power of God and His angelical messengers, or with the emissaries of evil and the kingdom of darkness. In the Medieval world view the seen and the unseen, the hidden and the evident, the revealed and the forthcoming, wrapped up in the present, were inseparable, and at their base lay the belief that this futurity could be foretold by signs, premonitions, and visions, leading to the prevention of the schemes of the wicked and the rescue, by fright, of men on the downward paths of destruction. Wherever the conditions upon which the interpositions of God's hand rested, and wherever His appointed servants were refused a hearing, Satan was let loose and admitted to the haunts of men to work harm and destruction without hindrance.*

It is not strange that in such an atmosphere Ansgar, at the beginning of the ninth century, had his marvelous visions: his call, at the age of twelve years, from his departed mother, who came to him in a dream, to a life of unworldliness and sanctity; his call to martyrdom in the service of the Gospel, when in a dream he passed without fear through the horror of death and communed with the Apostles Peter and Paul; his call to repentance, given him by Jesus whom he saw dressed in Jewish garb, His eyes aflame with heavenly light, who visited him by night in a dream, and pardoned his sins; and his call to the mission field of the North, among the Friesians and the Danes, when, scarcely twenty-five years old, he heard a voice say to him by night: "Thy sins are forgiven thee";

* Von Hurter, *Geschichte Innocenz des Dritten,* Band IV, Seite 505-508.

and in answer to the question: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" say: "Go and preach the Gospel to the heathen." * It is not to be wondered at that midst such surroundings the doctrine of Transubstantiation and the invocation of God by the miracle-working power of a divinely appointed representative and intermediary agency was developed, and commanded the unshaken faith of unnumbered thousands, from peasant to priest, from prince to Pope. It was in such an atmosphere as this that Innocent III wrote his disquisition on the sacrifice of the Mass. Moreover, that age of marvels, ghosts and goblins, of torturing, unexplainable fear when in the dark, cast the shadow of its presence far into the nineteenth century, as many men and women still living can testify from the experiences of their own childhood. In those centuries of faith and pious fiction, with God's hidden and interposing Presence everywhere to affright the believer and to crush the heretic and the sinner, it was a thing undreamed of to pry into the secrets of Nature, and to question the authority of the representatives and administrators of religion.

The modern world view has grown up upon the discovery of another order of truth, and a higher conception of the history and meaning of the universe. The world of mysterious apprehension and unmitigated terror has vanished gradually, to give place to the world of moral and intellectual freedom, which has found the differentiation between the material and the spiritual, the real and the ideal, the immanent and the transcendent, the physical and the psychical,

* Böringer, *Die Kirche Christi,* Band XIII, pp. 172-189.

law, mystery and miracle, tradition and trustworthy testimony, the proper sphere of human authority and action in relation to God and His revelations in the field of religious faith. The sense of timidity, suppression, oppression, and terror has given place to the sense of vastness, cosmical depth, duration, immensity, grandeur, and awe. To the mind and soul of the Christian in the opening years of the Modern Age, the Gospel sounds the note of victory from height to height, in the freedom of the Spirit, in God and His Christ, brought back again across many intervening centuries of infantile ignorance and superstition. The supremacy of caprice, in a world peopled by the imagination with the imagery of unreality, has been succeeded by the dominant conception of a world governed by a law of mysterious and unfathomable continuity, development and progress, by which God is not ruled out of His universe, but through which He gives evidence of His immanence in it.

## VIII

## THE MODERNISTS, THE MASS, AND THE HOLY SUPPER

THE Modernists deny the miracle of the Virgin Birth of Christ. Hence they cannot possibly, neither do they, find a miracle in the sacrifice of the Mass. Therefore they part company with the doctrine of Transubstantiation as expounded by Paschasius Radbertus in the ninth century, and by Pope Innocent III in the thirteenth century. What then is it that the Modernist priest sees and finds in the Mass? He preserves the traditional form of the sacramental service of the altar, but in thought and fact he returns to the *Agape,* the memorial love-feast of the primitive Christian community, commemorative of the Church's Founder, and the communion with Him, not tangibly under the form of physical elements in transmutation, but with the unseen Spirit and Presence of the Christ, indwelling in the Christian community, or congregation, in the visible forms and symbols and medii of the service of the Church, and in the unfolding impartations and manifestations in His followers, mystically, of the power of the endless life. "Once more let me repeat," says Sabatier, "the Modernist Catholic destroys nothing and gives up nothing; he accepts everything and makes it live. The Mass, the present centre

of worship, does not become for him an antiquarian rite, like those Buddhist ceremonies sometimes performed in our great capitals for the delectation of a sceptical and *blasé* public; it remains what it is, or rather it gains new significance and new life. The sighs of the ages have passed through it, the first dim struggles of awakening religious thought have left their traces there in the mysterious figure of Melchizedek; the memory of the Jewish Passover pervades it, in wondrous harmony with the memory of the Upper Room. The Christian Passover is born, a feast of love and communion, whose end is not only to nourish our life from day to day but to give us strength to face the toil of the morrow—a feast from which the disciple rises, uttering no mere passive *fiat,* but going forth to his work and to his labour. 'I go, Lord, to help forward, as much as in me lies, the realization of thy kingdom.' It is a banquet of those who find full satisfaction neither in the past nor the present, but know that they are going forth to their agony, to the great struggle—'Arise, let us go hence.'"

The development which began thousands of years before did not cease with the Christ. St. Paul turns the gaze of his communicants eagerly toward the future: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (I Corinthians 11:26.) A generation passes and the perspective is enlarged. The *Didachè* puts on the lips of the Christians of its time one of the most beautiful prayers the human soul has ever lisped, a hymn of thanksgiving in which the Church becomes conscious

of her catholicity, of her oneness not only with her members but with all Nature; in which she feels herself very weak and very imperfect, but feels also the infinite power which the consciousness of her vocation gives her.

"As this bread that is broken was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together, and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom. . . . Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver her from all evil, and to perfect her in Thy love, and gather together from the four winds her that is sanctified into Thy kingdom which Thou didst prepare for her."

Then come the Middle Ages, the time of great dogmatic definition; the cult of the Holy Sacrament, the cathedrals and processions—expressions, all these, of thought which stammers in its utterance and yet grows clearer and clearer. And when at last the Modernist priest reaches the present time, you can understand what emotion must fill him when he sees afar off the great masses who have never heard of Christ or the Church, when he sees them turning toward those ideas of union, of solidarity, of peace, of labour, and of liberty which have found their completest expression in the Eucharistic Feast.

For such a priest the Mass is anything but a mere rite, an empty form, a ceremonial turning to the East; it gives breadth and purpose to his life, and is at once its historic and its symbolic expression. His whole existence, one might say, is but a translation into deeds of the aspirations which the liturgy puts on the lips of the celebrant at the most solemn moment of the

consecration of the Eucharist. *Communicantes,* murmurs the priest, in a low, low voice, like words of love which a man speaks to his betrothed and hardly articulates, because he feels their weakness." *

Thus we see, as has been stated, that the outward form remains in every feature of the service of the Mass when celebrated by the Modernist priest, but the significance, as one can readily glean from the words of Sabatier, has changed. The Medieval conception of the mystical sacrifice of Christ made daily by the priest as an atonement for sin is gone. The Jesus of history is not there, neither mystically in Transubstantiation, nor memorially in the Spirit, in the evangelical sense, but idealistically only. The congregation, the church, therefore, in this particular view of the celebration of the Mass, reaches the climax of self-communion in the Christ-Thought, which dominates every soul and is regnant in the fellowship. "Solidarity, love, communion," says Sabatier, "are the words which rise oftenest to one's lips when one tries to understand the character of the new movement. The Modernists are quite resolved to conform to the end, if they can, to all the Church's laws. But their obedience is not the formal compliance of a lawyer, nor the dumb servility of a mercenary slave. It is the obedience of sons, a close, living union with the Church, a sharing in her movement and activity. In one word, Modernism is an awakening. Had it occurred amid Protestant surroundings, it would have taken the form of individual conversions and regen-

* Paul Sabatier, *Modernism,* pp. 153-157. Charles Scribner's Sons.

erations, but occurring amid Catholic surroundings, it has taken the form of an intense need for communion —communion with the past by exegetical and historical study, communion with the present by a new apologetic and by democratic endeavour, and communion with the future which men are striving to prepare. It is an unexpected current of mysticism, passing over our age and giving unspeakable fervour and power to those who drink of it."* It is profoundly interesting to compare this interpretation of the Mass with the teaching of the *Heidelberg Catechism* concerning the Lord's Supper.

The Reformed Church holds that our Lord calls bread and wine His body and blood because we are to understand thereby, that as bread and wine nourish and sustain our bodily life, so through the same tokens, which are called the crucified body and spilt blood of Christ, faith in the crucified Son of God, Jesus, will remove all the weariness, hunger, and thirst of the heart, the whole misery of man in time, and there will be presented in its stead the gift of Christ's righteousness, new life, joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost. God furthermore has given this token to the Church that the believer may have surety, for Christ's sake, of the pardon of his sins, and that through the Holy Spirit he may become united with Christ, attain to His likeness, and alone through the merits of the Saviour receive eternal life and glory, by heeding the promise of God as found in Holy Scripture, and made manifest periodically in the sacra-

* Paul Sabatier, *Modernism,* pp. 87, 88. Charles Scribner's Sons.

ments. These tokens, in the third place, are called the body and blood of Christ, because the Holy Communion, though commemorative of the one sacrifice of Jesus on the cross, is not an empty memorial meal, but a sacred symbolic act of worship in which our Lord communicates to His followers, in increasing measure, His divine love and favour, and through the revealed activity of the Holy Spirit assures them of eternal life. Hence when the Apostle says: "For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread," he means that all believing participants in the Holy Communion are without question members of Christ, who is the Head of the Church, whose spiritual body we constitute, a fellowship which cannot be created in a material way, but which is the fruit of the Spirit.* At the communion table the bond of Christ's love embraces the whole brotherhood, and the fellowship of believers among one another grows more intimate, holy, and fruitful of blessing. Communion with Christ, who loved us even unto death, must make us ever more willing and able to fulfil the precept of Christ: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you." When our hearts are filled with the Spirit, the Holy Sacrament blesses us with the fruits of fraternal affection, and the world then knows that we belong to the companionship of Christ.† Thus like the Modernist priest in his fellowship, the truly consecrated Evangelical pastor, when standing at the altar,

*Karl Sudhoff, *Communion Book,* 1859. Dedicated to his dear friends in Holland. Pp. 46, 50, 51, 55.

† I Corinthians 10:17; St. John 13:34.

or table of the Lord, may say in a low, low voice: *Communicantes,* impart Thyself, loved Master, with all that is true and eternal in the Church in past ages, to-day, and in the years to come. But the difference between them is very great. It is the difference between the divine act of redemption completed in a certain historic moment by Him in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and a mere beginning, but inscrutably wonderful, which carried within it the divine potency of coming generations, centuries, and ages.

"The New Covenant was to stand on the foundation of a full and everlasting remission of sins, which, again, was derived only from the blood of atonement, according to Christ's words," says Smeaton. "Thus the entire New Covenant recognized the death of Christ as its foundation. On the other hand, the New Covenant ceases to have any place where the doctrine of the atonement is not received, or where it is rejected, either under the influence of philosophical reasonings or of a legal bias; and the terrible judgment of God, called by our Lord dying in their sins (John 8:24)—a doom much more severe than that of dying for disobeying Moses' law—falls upon all who despise the blood of the covenant." (Hebrews 10:28.) "The atonement is described as the substance of the sacraments. They have neither significance nor value, except as they presuppose the great fact of a vicarious sacrifice for sin; and to keep the atonement perpetually before the eye of the Church, as the one fact on which our entire salvation rests, not only at the commencement, but also during the course of the

Christian's pilgrimage, the Lord deemed it fitting to institute these two sacraments in the Church. Thus the Christian disciple sees the atonement everywhere, and finds it in every Church institution. It is the one great fact from which he starts, and to which he ever returns." *

Sabatier says: "Thus, on whatever side we look, we see the characteristic feature of Modernism to be such a sense of life as is only to be found elsewhere, in so high a degree, in the parables of Jesus. But Modernism has not only the sense of life, it has the possession of it. The offspring of the past, it feels itself also the parent of the future. Its activity and its life are transformed by this consciousness, even down to mere details of worship and liturgical use. For it a whole crowd of questions which distress other people do not even present themselves. The idea, for instance, of going back to the beginnings of the Church, and reconstructing the scene of the Last Supper, would seem to a Modernist as *naïve* as if a grown man were to make impossible attempts to become a child again. The idea of seeking for the period at which Christianity received its most perfect expression would seem to him the dream of an archeologist arranging an historical exhibition.†

Von Hurter espoused the Medieval doctrine of the Lord's Supper, based upon the vicarious atonement of the God-man. His gifted successor at the Minster in

* Professor George Smeaton, *The Doctrine of the Atonement as Taught by Christ Himself*, p. 339. Edinburgh.

† Paul Sabatier, *Modernism*, pp. 152, 153. Charles Scribner's Sons.

Schaffhausen vainly strove to check the depressing effect of Von Hurter's defection, and the encroachments of Rationalism, by an heroic defence of the Reformed confessional faith, whose teaching concerning the Lord's Supper is in like manner associated with the Messianic atoning mission of the God-man. Judging by the trend of events, he evidently sought to save the essential ethical, spiritual and social elements of the Gospel by the elimination of characteristics in the Synoptic accounts of the life of Christ which seemed to be mythical, and therefore unhistorical. Under the reasoning of Strauss, the Jesus of the Evangelists, as the personal saving Friend of sinful man, evaporates and is lost to the world.

## IX

## SCHENKEL'S DEFECTION, THE VIRGIN BIRTH, AND ETHICAL PROTESTANTISM

NOT long after Schenkel had contributed his answer to Hagenbach, to the *Studien und Kritiken* (1845), he announced his final and radical departure from the orthodox Evangelical position. The change, which is all the more remarkable because of the former enthusiastic championship of the Reformed Faith, appears in the introductory pages of his *Characterbild Jesu,* and betokens a stage in the transition from the traditional Evangelical teachings to the idealistic Rationalism of Schleiermacher and the followers of Hegel, exhibiting itself with new modifications and touches of superb originality in Ritschlianism, and in the Modernism of the Abbé Loisy. As the result of not less than twenty-five years of study, investigation, uncertainty, and inner conflict, Schenkel says he reached the conclusion that the Fourth Gospel, in its present form, cannot be the work of the Apostle John, but must have originated among a group of later disciples. Thus through the writings of the famous critic, Dr. Ferdinand C. Baur of Tübingen, he claims to have at last reached a solid historical foundation upon which to base a life-picture of the Redeemer. To this end he made choice, for the first time in the history of Biblical criticism,

of the Second Gospel as a firm foundation, according to his view of the case, for a realistic life of Christ, and wrote his *Characterbild Jesu,* which in part is an answer to Renan's superficial *Vie de Jesu,* then just fresh from the press. His aim in writing the book was to prove that Jesus consecrated his whole life to the service of the poor, needy, afflicted, and down-trodden multitude, and thus to strengthen and establish the faith of the German nation in the Redeemer. He confesses that the preparation of the book deepened in his soul, beyond all former experience, his own conviction that Jesus is the *Light of the World,* and that however discouraging the present may be, he has the certainty that that Light will never be quenched.*

Dr. Meyer in his commentary on the Gospel of St. Mark gives his reasons for rejecting the early dates assigned by Hitzig (55-57) and Schenkel (45-58), but accepts the priority of Mark.† Godet (*Luke,* 556, Am. Ed.) observes, in opposition to the theory of Synoptic interdependence, that: "It is impossible to conceive anything more capricious and less reverential than the part which we make the author of any one whichsoever of our Synoptic Gospels play with the history and sayings of Jesus, supposing that he had before him the other two, or one of them. Such an explanation will only be allowable when we are brought absolutely to despair of finding any other. And even then it were better still to say: *Non liquet.* For this explanation involves a moral contradiction.

* Fourth Advent Week, 1863.

† Meyer, *Commentary of Mark*—Introduction. Funk and Wagnalls.

Most of our present critics are so well aware of this that they have recourse to middle terms. By common sources they seek to explain the relation between those three writings, or they combine this mode with the preceding (i.e., interdependence)." Dr. Matthew B. Riddle, the American editor of *Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament,* draws the conclusion that the laboured efforts to solve the Synoptic problem have shed light on one point, namely, the originality of the Gospel of St. Mark. He adds that this impression is confirmed by internal evidence, when the Gospel of Mark is read before the Gospel of Matthew, and that most of the evidence in favour of the priority and originality of Mark also sustains its independence of any earlier document like the Logia, or "earlier source," suggested by Meyer and Weiss.*

All who reject the Virgin Birth of Jesus have great predilection for the Gospel of Mark and the theory of its priority. They believe that the absence of the account of the miraculous conception of Christ brings the portrait of our Lord, as drawn by John Mark, within the limits of Nature and the current of history. But the distinct purpose of the Gospel of Mark to prove the Messiahship of Jesus shows that the omission of the genealogy and childhood of Jesus did not arise from a neutral or negative attitude, but occurred without design, before the omitted traditions, as some hold, were looked upon as necessary elements of the Gospel. Probably the real cause of the omission will never be discovered.

* Meyer, *Commentary on the New Testament*—Mark and Luke. Note, p. 11. Funk and Wagnalls.

Built up upon the foundation of Mark's Gospel, Schenkel's *Characterbild Jesu* forms one of the connecting links between the older orthodox and the newer idealistic view of Jesus. His object was not to destroy, but to protect and strengthen the kernel of saving truth by readjustment to critical conclusions and the temper of the new era. He fell short in his aim, but his purpose was not evil. He is not to be classified with the vulgar rationalists, who were unable or did not want to understand the Gospel. For a great many years I have had a copy of Schenkel's *Characterbild Jesu* in my library, but it is only recently, during the preparation of this study of Modernism, that I discovered the importance of the work, with all its shortcomings and insufficiency, in the history of modern Biblical criticism and its results. Dr. Schenkel was a wonderful man, a pulpit orator of remarkable power, a successful teacher of theology in the University of Heidelberg, and a versatile, finished, and voluminous writer on Biblical, historical, and theological subjects. And yet following his ardent, pronounced, and uncompromising defence and advocacy of Protestantism, he says in his *Characterbild Jesu:* "How can one prohibit the reason and the understanding from investigating the scientific and historical justification of the doctrines which emanated from them, and were often put to false and unjust use? How shall one demand from them that they shall bow down blindly before their own imperfect work with all the reverence due a divine revelation? And yet the ecclesiastical teaching concerning the Person of the Saviour could be defended only by the

silencing of the reason and understanding, and the exaction of a blind faith in the doctrine, even made compulsory by force, according to circumstances. The result was that from then on two kinds of truth were recognized, the truth of reason in the field of the sciences and the truth of faith in the realm of theology. Yonder one investigated. Here one submitted, especially as long as the slightest contradiction of the dominant doctrine was punished with fire and sword. One wonders that the Catholic system of doctrine remained unshattered for so long a time. The history of heresy during the Middle Ages solves this problem. Through the most unscrupulous agencies of power, through a horrible system of suppression, unheard of before, it is possible to immortalize every error.

When once a cleavage between knowledge and faith, reason and piety, worldly wisdom and church dogma, had been accomplished through the teaching of Christ, the further consequence was unavoidable, that this cleavage should gradually penetrate all the relations of life, causing a separation between Church and State, clergy and people, the people and the theologians, a process in which the spiritual element throughout triumphed over the worldly, the monastic life was held more sacred than family life, the Papacy more glorious than the Empire. Just as the Godhead in the Person of Christ meant infinitely more than the humanity, so the churchly truths of faith signified infinitely more than the secular truths of reason. The secular, civil, and national existence, in and for itself, seemed valueless and without eternal content. True

worth and actual claim to recognition could be won for it only by union with the divine, and to consummate this, the bearers of the Church's truths of faith and treasures of grace, the priests, were indispensable, who out of the fulness of the gifts and blessings entrusted to them exclusively dispensed the means of grace only on condition that they be received with faith, that is, with complete self-surrender of intellect and will. The decisive break of the Church with the claims of reason, the results of scientific research, and progress in spiritual culture, found its most signal expression in the doctrine of the Mass, or the continuous bodily sacrifice of Christ by the priesthood as an expiation for the congregation. In the Mass the lay mind was required to believe that a thing can transmute its essence without changing its attributes, and the lay mind acquiesced in that "faith," after those who ventured to deny it had met with the most dire consequences. But the Church, which in this point had maintained an advantage over the lay mind, dared to claim everything. A sense of unlimited power necessarily drove her to dizzy heights of overreaching self-exaltation.

The Reformers, Schenkel asserts in his *Charakterbild Jesu,* did not hazard a scrutiny of the traditional doctrine of the Person of Christ. Nevertheless the pivotal point of departure, in the course of time, by itself alone led to a fundamental renewal of the same. Roman Catholicism had silenced personal lay activity in the sphere of piety. All the personal responsibility, all care and effort for the salvation of the soul, had been assumed by the substitutionary Church. Hence

Catholic piety is essentially *churchly,* and Catholic faith is self-abnegating submission to churchly authority. Protestantism, on the other hand, had recognized the right and freedom of conscience on the part of the "laity" in the sphere of piety. According to its fundamental presupposition, every Christian must on his personal responsibility work out his own salvation. Care and work for the Church are transferred to the congregation itself, and thus to every member associated with it. Protestant piety, therefore, is essentially ethical, and Protestant faith is personal religious and ethical self-culture in immediate relation to God.

Roman Catholicism, because it is essentially churchly, also rests essentially upon tradition. To this, that is to statutes and organization, it is welded as by iron bands. Departure from its traditions would mean abandonment of its foundations. On this ground even the hope that true Roman Catholicism will ever decide to institute reform is an idle dream. The hour of its reform would be the hour of its self-annihilation.

Protestantism, because essentially ethical in character, rests therefore essentially upon free investigation. It is not interested in a perpetuation of tradition and given conditions at any price. It has, on the contrary, broken with the statutes and organization of the past at the expense of all its power. It is not the religion of ecclesiastical or political interests, but the religion of the eternal need of man, the religion of the conscience, of the reason renewed by the conscience, and of the will sanctified by enlightened reason. Therefore it is not satisfied with inherited rules and con-

formities when they begin to serve only the aims of selfishness and self-advantage, but drives steadily forward to knock at the portals of Truth, and does not rest until it has pressed on to the final causes and ultimate powers which condition and produce the process of the religio-ethical development of mankind.

When Protestantism, without further scrutiny and examination, incorporated the medieval Catholic doctrine concerning the Person of Christ in its confession and doctrinal conception, that act was still a Roman Catholic procedure. Fearing the consequences, the Reformers refrained from applying fundamental principles to this doctrine. But punishment for a static or revolutionary attitude as a rule usually soon ensues. Here Schenkel reiterates his advanced view that the Christian doctrine of faith is essentially determined by the doctrine of the Person of Christ.

The Reformers had left the contradictory statements of the Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the Person of Christ unchanged, and hence it followed necessarily that the conception of faith had to be fixed in a manner which excluded the scientific examination of the content of faith. In fact, notably on the Lutheran side, the Protestant confessional writings demand a faith which, as a rule, eschews the free flow of thought, turns aside every admixture of the reason in the construction of Church doctrine, and subordinates itself for weal or woe to the traditional Church doctrine. This at bottom is simply the Catholic conception of doctrine. It lacks the ethical nerve of life, the sting of conscience, the unquenchable charm of the passion for truth. Protestantism thereby denied

its origin, its destiny, its moving root-principle. It forgot that the doctrinal teachings concerning the Person of Christ, derived from the Catholic Church, had in like manner at that point engaged the activity of the human reason and understanding. While it prided itself that it had parted company with the ban of human statutes, which it did according to first principles, it perpetuated, without any scruples of conscience, even with the external application of force, the statutes of ancient ecclesiastical councils and the doctrinal formulas of Roman Catholic theologians, and without mercy pressed the yoke of an outworn law and letter upon the minds of men.

# X

## THE REFORMERS AND THE PERSON OF CHRIST

SCHENKEL overlooked or ignored the fact that the Reformers of the sixteenth century fully realized the danger to Christianity involved in the attack which was renewed in the period of the Reformation upon the doctrine of the divine-human Person of Christ. This fact is clearly substantiated by the career, trial, and fate of Michael Servetus. Almost from the day on which the execution occurred, John Calvin has been charged with the crime of procuring the murder of the Spanish physician, and this aspersion has become a fixed, unquestioned, historical impression which is handed down from one age to the next. It is believed, without inquiry or research, that Servetus was a learned but unfortunate Spaniard, who, on account of a few heretical views of indifferent importance, was being pursued as a malefactor by the Catholics, entered Geneva and fell into the cruel, merciless hands of Calvin, was tried as a dangerous theological dissenter, and by the arbitrary sentence of the Reformer alone was condemned to suffer a horrible death at the stake.

In the first place, the statutory law of the little theocratic republic made blasphemy punishable with death. Several other men, among them Gruet and Monet,

native Genevans, suffered death for the same cause a number of years before Servetus was burned. Stähelin says that these horrors were the fruit of the system in vogue, and are not to be charged against the personal character of Calvin, nor his doctrinal views. The age as a whole was at fault, which, though it had taken the initial steps to free itself from the Roman pseudo-theocracy, still continued to be enthralled by and to cherish the colossal ideal error of a Christian state, sound and unimpeachable in doctrine, and possessing the official prerogative to protect theological orthodoxy at the point of the sword, and with fagot and fire. All the religious bodies which were consulted concerning the activity of Servetus, and all the Reformers, even Bullinger and Melanchthon, declared it to be necessary to take drastic measures to check his vicious assailment of Trinitarian Christianity. Servetus was a highly gifted young man, and in many respects equalled any of the Reformers in learning, even Calvin himself. Both Servetus and Calvin were born in the year 1509. Servetus was the son of pious Christian parents, and received the best university training which could be obtained. He was more or less familiar with Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, and Italian. Spanish was his native language. He was well versed in the Bible, the ancient "Fathers," and the scholastic writers. He was not immoral in his daily life, but in the pursuit of objects and the promulgation of his theological views and prejudices he was untruthful, disingenuous, dishonest, fanatical, and mean. He sadly lacked lofty nobility of character. Early in his career he read the

principal writings of the Reformers, and conceived the ruling ambition to meet and defeat John Calvin. For many years he continued to take part in the Catholic ritual, after he had abandoned all faith in the Roman Catholic system of religion.* He lived in Vienne, in France, under an assumed name, and there anonymously wrote and published a scurrilous book entitled *Christian Instruction,* a manuscript copy of which he sent to Calvin without concealing his identity.

Another book, written in the same style and spirit, and entitled *De Trinitatis Erroribus Libri septem,* Luther called a shockingly wicked production.† Luther, however, died a number of years before the career of Servetus reached its climax. One of the prominent citizens of Geneva at this time was a Frenchman by the name of William de Trie, who had left Lyons, his native place, for the sake of the Protestant faith. Antoine Arneys, a relative of his, and an enthusiastic Catholic, sought to win him back to his former affiliations by emphasizing all the weak points in Protestantism as compared with Catholic antiquity, unity, fellowship, and peace. This amazed De Trie, in view of the fact that the anonymous book on *Christian Instruction,* by Servetus, full of all manner of excessive abuse of the Trinitarian theology and its exponents, had just issued from the archiepiscopal press in Vienne, in France, where Arneys resided, and had been hurled into the neighbouring little Reformed

*Dr. Adolph Zahn, *Die Beiden Letzten Lebensjahre von Johannes Calvin,* p. 15.

†Dr. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church,* Vol. VI, p. 67. Charles Scribner's Sons.

republic of Geneva. In a letter De Trie expressed his astonishment that the Catholics so bitterly opposed and persecuted Protestants, and yet allowed the flagrantly abusive writings of a heretic like Michael Servetus to be printed on a Catholic diocesan press. When this inconsistency was pointed out to Arneys, he reported the incident to the chief inquisitor, Ory, in Lyon, who also was a relative, and thus Cardinal Tournon, the most bigoted and relentless defender of Catholic orthodoxy, took steps to apprehend Servetus. But the effort failed because of insufficient evidence, and the suave, specious, artful denials of the accused physician. To sustain his claim to veracity, De Trie, after much importunity, finally secured a few pages of the manuscript in the handwriting of Servetus and sent them to Arneys. Calvin at first refused to part with the pages, because, so he said, he had no authority to pass judgment upon Servetus, or to bring him to justice, and felt that it was his duty, if possible, by persuasion and sound Scriptural interpretation to convince him of his error and wrong-doing. He declared that it was not his prerogative to destroy heresy by the sword, but rather by instruction and enlightenment.

In the meantime Servetus, alias Villeneuve, fled from Catholic France and eluded the inquisitors. Why he sought refuge in Geneva, no one knows. Why he spent four weeks undisguised in the city, on his way to Italy, is a question which has never been satisfactorily answered. It is believed by some writers that he remained in Geneva so long, in anticipation of the overthrow of Calvin through the organized influ-

ence of the Libertines. Disappointed in his expectations, he was in the act of leaving the city when the authorities arrested him. His bold, bitter, untempered, and scurrilous attacks upon the fundamental theological doctrines of Christianity, and his defamation of the leaders of the Reformation, outraged the sense of decency possessed by many in that day to such a degree that by his prolonged and aggressive agitation throughout nearly the whole of western Europe he fairly courted his own destruction.

It is true that Calvin afterward changed his attitude of mind and sought to bring Servetus to trial. But he failed in his purpose, and, with the other Reformers who were present, left the hall in anger before anything definite had been accomplished. The members of the city council then calmly took charge of the case, and deliberately conducted it to its terrible and lamentable conclusion. Rilliet, who wrote a history of the trial of Servetus, based upon the original sources, states that he suffered death as a political offender, on account of rebellion only, and that his anti-Trinitarian views, however radical, would not at that juncture in themselves have led to his arrest. "La politique," says Rilliet, "joua un beaucoup plus grand rôle que la théologie dans ce procès; et il n'est pas douteux que si Servet avait réussai à faire envisager sa question comme dépouillée de toute conséquence pratique, l'issue de son procès n'aurait pas été sanglante." When the character and aim of the activity of Servetus were recounted to Zwingli in Zürich and Melanchthon in Wittenberg, they fully realized the danger involved therein, and the latter

expressed his anxiety in the following utterance: "Great God, must these questions also be raised? What confusion will thereby be created in the Church!" *

The Reformers most carefully, wisely, and conscientiously retained and preserved the ancient historic foundation of Christianity, and were fully aware of the peril to true, vital, saving faith which lurked in the fanatical, vicious, and sweeping attack which Servetus and his sympathizers at that time directed against the mediatorship of Christ, whose eternal Sonship they denied. Servetus spoke and wrote of the three Persons in the Godhead as monstrosities of the devil, and the Triune God he called a three-headed hell-hound. In utter ignorance of the history of Christian doctrine, he declared that the doctrine of the Trinity arose in the Church with the rise and domination of the Popes, and must fall in company with them. He was rabid, unreasonable, and relentless in his agitation, and only quailed in fear and begged for mercy when he fell into the hands of his opponents and enemies.

Moreover, it must be remembered, in the second place, that Servetus sought Calvin's destruction, and with strange gladness and fiendish delight invited the conflict with the Genevan Reformer, apparently with the dominant purpose in view that one or the other should die. He called Calvin "Simon Magus," and thus suggested that he regarded himself as a second Saint Paul. In his twenty-seventh letter to Calvin,

* Dr. E. Stähelin, *Johannes Calvin,* Vol. I, p. 427. Elberfeld, 1863.

in connection with a reference to Ananias and Sapphira, he expressed the opinion that unyielding wickedness and malice should be punished with death: "Hoc crimen est morte simpliciter dignum." In a letter to Abel Poupin he said: "I am certain that I will suffer death on account of this thing, but I am not cast down in spirit because of it, in order that I, the disciple, may be equal to my Master." He believed himself to be greater than all the Church Fathers and Reformers. Though he trembled when in the hands of those whom he assailed, and prejudiced his case seriously at the trial in Geneva by his denials, misrepresentation, and untruthfulness, he seemed in reality to crave a martyr's crown. In all probability, when, bound for Italy, he tarried in Geneva, he did not expect to be apprehended and condemned to death. For this reason he was horrified and gave way to heart-rending lamentation and cries for mercy on hearing the terrible sentence pronounced upon him by the council. Farel repeatedly visited him and importuned him to retract his errors. Calvin and he forgave each other in the prison, and mutually disavowed all personal enmity. Calvin not only besought Servetus to renounce his heretical position, but also plead for a commutation of the sentence to some milder form of punishment. His effort proved futile, for they told him that after a verdict had been rendered according to law, it could be neither modified nor reversed. Thus, notwithstanding the prominent and aggressive part that Farel and Calvin took in the trial, by their inquisitorial catechization, their tenaciously drastic method to compel Servetus to retract, and their in-

sistent effort to draw from him a recognition of the eternal Sonship of Jesus, the die was finally cast against Servetus by the city council, after the withdrawal of the Reformers from the council chamber in painful chagrin and defiant defeat, but invincible in their conviction concerning the deity of Christ. Servetus, also, though trembling with fear, proclaiming his innocence, and anxiously crying for mercy, clung immovably to his doctrinal views, and with equal firmness heroically met death by slow, inhuman, wicked torture.

Moreover, finally, Calvin's influence in Geneva amounted to less during the trial of Servetus than at any other time, and it is therefore absolutely unhistorical to represent Calvin as the chief figure in the proceedings against the Spaniard. After the arrest and arraignment of Servetus, the process took its course according to law, and Calvin was simply an important witness and instrument in the case. After the trial had ended Calvin did everything in his power to effect a commutation of the horrible sentence, but without avail, for neither Servetus nor the city authorities would yield a single step. Stähelin says it may sound paradoxical, but is nevertheless true, that Rome is responsible also for the Protestant stakes and scaffolds, because for centuries it inculcated principles and practices among Christians, in relation to heresy, which emanated from a world view whose sole object was dominion, unity, uniformity, conformity, and ownership of conscience. The Reformers could not at once free themselves from the aims and influence of ecclesiastical power under which they grew up,

and which controlled them to an amazing degree, in spite of all the light they had attained through the new learning, and from the Scriptures. To us the thought that any one should be burned to death for opinion's sake is horrifying, and our sense of justice and freedom is outraged by the crime itself. It is to be deplored that Servetus died through such causes, under such circumstances, and in the midst of such surroundings. It is impossible to change men's minds, ideas, or opinions by mutilations and burnings. A man may be frightened into a recantation by the horror of such a punishment, but he cannot thus be forced to erase his mental impressions, and alter an inwrought temperament or disposition. By the threatened torture he is merely terrorized into telling a lie, into being untrue to himself, however mistaken, at bottom, he may be in his fancies and contentions.

Both Catholics and Protestants looked upon Servetus as we look upon the anarchist. There existed a confused overlapping and intermingling of the functions of Church and State, which men since then, in the onward march of liberty, have cleared away. The Greeks poisoned Socrates, the philosopher of the conscience, because they imagined that he corrupted the youth of Athens. Brutus and his friends slew Julius Cæsar, the idol of the populace, because he was ambitious. Jews and Romans crucified Jesus of Nazareth, the Saviour of the world, because He made Himself equal with God and founded a new kingdom. The pagan emperors hurled the early followers of Jesus to the lions in the arena, and tortured them to death by thousands, because in that kingdom they found

eternal life. The Roman Catholics and the Emperor Sigismund, by an act of the Council of Constance, burned John Huss and Jerome of Prague because they tried to purify the Church. For similar reasons blood flowed in Paris on St. Bartholomew's Night, the fires were lighted on Smithfield Common, and Philip II declared war against The Netherlands. And finally Servetus suffered death at the stake in Protestant Geneva because he blasphemed the Holy Trinity and befriended the seditious Libertines. But men ought to cease to make a mockery of historic fact by blaming this terrible deed solely and alone upon the Genevan Reformer, John Calvin, who imperiled his own life to defend the eternal Sonship of Jesus.*

Schenkel says the key to Rationalism lies in the traditional doctrine concerning the Person of Christ. It did not carefully disentangle this knot, but cut it in two by a rather blunt blow of the sword. However, it never did justice, either religiously or historically, to the exalted and unique character portrait of Jesus. Christianity is a religion. Rationalism is a scholastic conception. Roman Catholicism wrought out its portrait of Jesus acording to its Church interests. Rationalism shaped it according to philosophical preconceptions, which were, we do not deny it, very faulty and unsatisfactory. The Rationalistic portrait of Jesus not only leaves the feelings unmoved, the fancy empty, the soul indifferent, but so darkens the understanding in its deeper penetration that it fails to grasp

* Stähelin, *Johannes Calvin*, Vol. I, p. 422. See also the exceptionally graphic account of the trial of Servetus given by M. Guizot, *John Calvin*, chapter xvii. I. K. Funk & Co.

how this wise rabbi of Nazareth, this enlightened Jew, punished for his love of light by priestly hatred and official jealousy, succeeded in establishing a world religion, and for future centuries prescribed paths to the currents of universal advancement in culture.

The founding of an order of Illuminati would have been far more in keeping with the preconceptions of the Rationalistic theology than the establishment by Christ of a world Church. Really it is not possible to believe in the Christ of Rationalism. His Person is entirely transparent and comprehensible to the understanding, only not His power and influence. This is because the Christ of Rationalism lacks communion with the divine, the Infinite. The divine does not appear as present in Him. The divine is supernatural and therefore no new revelation came in with Christ, no new creative point of departure in the history of the world. Because from the standpoint of Rationalism Christ is merely the human bearer of a religio-ethical stage of knowledge, it not only wants the idea of the Church, but far more the reality of the congregation, or community of believers. The pulpit becomes a lecturer's desk, the congregation an audience.

But while Rationalism dissolved the contradictory traditional formulas concerning the Person of Christ, the Redeemer thereby was brought humanly nearer to men, and awakened a sense of need which could find its true satisfaction alone in an ethico-personal communion with Christ. In this respect, Schenkel asserts, Schleiermacher's doctrine of Christ surpasses Rationalism. The portrait of Jesus which that great theologian unfolded was drawn in response to the needs

of the human heart, which feels the unquenchable aspiration to live in immediate communion with God, and to become assured of the personal possession of the Holy and Eternal One. According to Schleiermacher, in the Person of Christ the eternal and holy is itself humanly present to man. The living communion with Christ is the communion of man with the Divine Life itself. The brittle metal of the old ecclesiastical doctrinal formulas was remelted and poured into the warm channel of modern pious feeling. The shell of miracle dropped down as slag in the melting-pot, the ethical figure of the Saviour rises from it like polished gold. The portrait of Christ, as the ethical ideal of the human heart, is the deepest truth in the theology of Schleiermacher, in Schenkel's view. One of its most beneficial results was that it also placed upon faith a truer ethical valuation as free personal resignation to the divine Idea, actualized in the Person of Jesus.

Schenkel pronounces the *Life of Christ,* by Strauss, to be overwhelmingly negative and absolutely unsatisfying. Therefore the great task which needs to be accomplished for the modern world is the preparation of a true portrait of Jesus, based upon the sources at command, true to history and tradition. The dark horror of the merely supernatural, as the Medieval Church promulgated it in her ordinances and regulations; the servile fear of the punitive provisions of civil law in the interest of the Church; the hope of final reward and the dread of future torment, as inherited supports of Christianity have served their day and are worm-eaten. Faith in the Redeemer of the

world must rest upon firmer foundations than superstition, priestly domination, and an imagination filled with visions of joy or horror. The confidence, the love, the ready consecration of the members of the Church must become the columns and pillars upon which that faith shall rest in the years to come. It must be the fruit of universal conviction, of the spiritual and ethical needs of the nations, of the culture elements of all time. Through it culture must first reach its consecration, and civilization its depth.*

* Daniel Schenkel, *Das Characterbild Jesu,* pp. 4-12.

## XI

## THE GOSPELS AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH

SCHLEIERMACHER'S scrutiny of the genealogies of Matthew and Luke shows why Schenkel was in such hearty accord with him in relation to the effort made by mediating and liberal theologians to bring the infancy and childhood of Jesus within the boundary of the natural world and the indubitable laws of history. It is rather surprising that Dr. James Orr does not make any allusion in his work on the *Virgin Birth* * to the views of Schleiermacher on this subject, as set forth in a volume of lectures entitled *Das Leben Jesu,* published after the author's death, and consisting of extensive notes edited by R. A. Rütenik, one of his students.† Concerning the miraculous conception, Schleiermacher says: "If the Redeemer was to be free from sin,—and *that* is essential to the idea of redemption,—He also had to be free from original sin. This, too, I grant. But if I ask what conception of original sin fundamentally justifies the declaration that because Jesus was conceived without the presence of a man He was free from original sin, the problem defies thought. For if one understands thereby the transmission of sin growing out of

* Dr. James Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Our Lord.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907.

† Schleiermacher, *Das Leben Jesu,* p. 60.

the subordination of one being to another through physical influence in conception, the law holds good only half way, because the influence of Mary still remains. Two supplemental explanations have been offered to dispose of the difficulty, but have not been accepted by the Church generally; first, that Mary had no physical influence upon the conception of Jesus, that Christ brought His body from Heaven, and that Mary was only a channel through which He passed; and, second, that Mary also was conceived in a supernatural manner.*

If the first explanation in its first part is supernatural and docetic, on the ground that Christ brought his human part with him from Heaven, and therefore must be rejected, the second part of it proves inadequate for the same reason. In the second case the sinlessness would have to be traced to the first human pair, and in the last analysis brought down from Eve, for Mary herself stood under the female (her mother's) influence, and a sinless origin on her part could alone be traced from Eve. Now this cannot be maintained, and, moreover, no conception of original sin can be brought into harmony with the idea of redemption through Christ, which makes the necessary demand that to be free from sin, the very beginning of life must have been free from physical influence. But if we say that Christ was conceived without the presence of a man, the indwelling of the divine cannot

* Since these words were written, in 1864, the Roman Catholic Church has adopted and promulgated the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, by authority of the Vatican Council of 1869 and 1870.

rest upon this fact alone, but calls for a positive divine act, and then the divine act must have been sufficient to make Christ free from all taint of original sin, notwithstanding the physical influence which must have been exerted upon Him, if His life was to be truly human. We can therefore deal with this question without fear of endangering the Christian faith, even if we should be compelled to declare that the supernatural conception of Jesus is not historically fully substantiated.

If now, Schleiermacher says, we appeal directly to the Synoptic record, and view both Evangelists independently, the passage in Luke demands a different interpretation, involving the possibility of the presence of Joseph at the conception of Christ, with the further elucidation that He became the Son of God through the overshadowing presence of the power of the Most High. The account in Matthew is nothing more than the narrative of a dream, and in this case proof must be established that the dream arose through divine agency, an essential not mentioned in the narrative, and therefore the account is uncertain.

The interest of faith regarding this question can be twofold only, the first part of it bearing upon the truth of the account, in relation to the doctrine of Scripture, and the second part treating of the doctrine of the Person of Christ, where faith demands that in the origination of the Life of Christ nothing sinful shall enter.

Since Luke's account confines the movement to circles of purely Jewish life and the theocratic faith, and contains only elements which agreed with the

circumstances of the time, this narrative possesses a far higher degree of naturalness than the one in Matthew. But if we take the later points in Matthew, the Bethlehemitic child murder and the flight into Egypt as a record of actual facts, they did not necessarily arise from the former, nor do they spring from the tendency to recognize Christ, and hence the probability is great that these are historic events, for the reference to an Old Testament passage in connection with the murder of the Bethlehem children, recorded in Matthew, is such that one could have full faith in the Messianic prophecies, without the suggestion that an event was to transpire in the life of Christ to which the weeping of Rachel and her children would necessarily apply as a prophecy. This also we cannot explain in that manner, but must assume that a fact in some sense lies at its foundation. He says he deals very sceptically with this subject; for if we cannot recognize any original authentic source and it does not appear probable that this narrative, as we have it, comes directly from eye-witnesses, it behooves us, since we are occupied with an historical investigation, not to lay any value upon the difference between canonical and apocryphal characters, but to presuppose the possibility that this narrative possesses an apocryphal character, because a tendency in that direction lies at its foundation. Therefore, Schleiermacher says, it seems necessary to him to deal with it in that manner.

If now we rest here, he continues, and say that Joseph and Mary are living together in quietude and peace in Nazareth, and that Jesus is growing in the

stature of a man day by day, then we must conclude that when John wrote his Gospel the childhood traditions had long been forgotten, or that St. John did not regard them as essential to a history of Christ, because of an idea dominant in all the Gospels. All that is wonderful about His childhood must have lost its importance by the time Jesus began His public ministry, and if these accounts had been current in even a small circle of relatives, they would not have passed unmentioned in later years. We must remember that the Jews in the time of Christ sought more and more earnestly for a person in whom the Messianic hope might find its realization. Many of those who were familiar with the story of these wonders had left the scenes of earthly activity when Jesus was ready to begin His public ministry. If the Synoptic account as a whole was widely known, and had left ineffaceable traces of a speedy fulfilment of that hope, a definite narrative like the miraculous conception would be handed down in company with the great hope. And if Jesus had in the meantime dwelt in seclusion, his public appearance would at once have led to the inquiry whether this was the same person to whom the early narratives pointed. But there is no trace of any childhood account which might have been current at the time, and therefore the birth story must have been considered of non-effect when Jesus began His public ministry, and of no significance for the creation of faith in Him.

Searching as is this dissection of the Synoptic accounts of the miraculous conception of Christ, not only does it leave the mystery of our Lord's real begin-

ning unsolved, but it has a tendency to deepen doubt as to His deity by failing to define the special and specific act of the Most High in association with the supposed fatherhood of Joseph. The latter view simply explains one miracle away by substituting another equally as great, and utterly unauthenticated by any data in the sacred record. Concerning the Synoptic problem the historian Froude pointedly says that it might almost seem as if the explanation was laid purposely beyond our reach. "One hypothesis, and so far as we can see one only, would make the mystery intelligible, that immediately on the close of our Lord's life some original sketch of it was drawn up by the congregation, which gradually grew and gathered round it, whatever His mother, His relatives, or His disciples afterward individually might contribute. This primary history would thus not be the work of any one mind or man; it would be the joint work of the Church, and thus might well be called 'Memoirs of the Apostles,' and would naturally be quoted without the name of either one of them being specifically attached to it." *

One of the latest writers on the life of Christ, from the critical standpoint, is Frederick Loofs, a Ritschlian, a pupil of Harnack, and professor of Church History in the University of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany. After subjecting the doctrine of the Trinity to a searching, severe, and destructive examination, he nevertheless declares that the self-consciousness of Jesus breaks the frame of a purely human life, and

* Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects—Essays*, Vol. I, p. 240. Scribner's.

that the experience of believers in all the Christian centuries confirms the assumption that the disciples of Jesus were right in seeing more in Him than a mere man. And yet he contends that orthodox Christology cannot give an adequate appreciation of the Person of Jesus which will agree with the New Testament, and at the same time, by its freedom from the intricacies of old philosophies, be acceptable to thinking people, and adapted to the modern world view.* The divine revelation in which we as Christians believe was not made by means of an inspired book, but through men who were endowed by God with truth. The books of the Bible are the historical records of this revelation. Therefore we must combine historical knowledge with the affirmations of faith, to determine who Jesus was. Historical science must either reduce the allusions concerning the self-consciousness of Jesus to such an extent as to make them fit into the frame of a purely human life, or else it must declare itself utterly incompetent to give a final solution to the problem, and leave the mystery to faith, which is based upon inner experience, not of the people of yesterday, but of Christians of all ages. An ever-deepening knowledge of the grace, love, and holiness of God is disclosed by this faith in the cross of Christ.

These experiences are not foreign to the New Testament. They are not found outside of the Christian community, as observation shows. To the eye of faith Christ is the revelation of God. That is one thing

* Dr. Frederick Loofs. *What is the Truth about Jesus?* pp. 162, 201. Charles Scribner's Sons.

which faith possesses in Christ.* Jesus was a real man, and yet unlike all other men. He was a man in relation to whom the analogy of all other human experience is of no avail, a unique man among all the children of God, or sons of God, as the New Testament says, the unique one, the only begotten Son. Can formulas, can ideas be found which are able to make the unique historical Person of Jesus more intelligible than the orthodox Christology? Paul, like John, assumed that something divine, eternal, appeared in this historical Person, and like John, he unified, in his thought, this eternal something and the historical Christ. The same idea is found in the Gospel of John and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But we cannot determine how Paul and John and the writer to the Hebrews regarded this divine element in Jesus in relation to the One God. Loofs does not accept the Kenotic theory of Günther, Thomasius, Frank, and Gess, nor does he endorse the doctrine of the eternal Sonship without Kenosis, as advocated by Kunze and Schaeder. He also rejects the modified Trinitarian view of Reinhold Seeberg on the ground that the Synoptic sources do not contain the intimate and accurate acquaintance with the inner life of Jesus which it exhibits.†

Loofs also dissents from Schleiermacher and Ritschl because both of them sought to make the unique position of Jesus intelligible through the elements and

*Dr. F. Loofs, *What is the Truth about Jesus?* p. 214. Charles Scribner's Sons. *Idem*, p. 218.

† Seeberg, *Die Grundwahrheiten der Christlichen Religion*, 1902 and 1906.

facts of his human life. Neither Schleiermacher nor Ritschl denied that their views leave room for the presence of the superhuman in the self-consciousness of Jesus, but in the last analysis their formulas do not explain, they only describe the unique character of Jesus. Loofs holds that the revelation of God in Christ is more direct than is taught by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. Christ reveals God to us not only indirectly through His own faith in the Father, but also directly, through His words and works. Loofs does not endorse the view of Martin Kaehler of Halle, who, though teaching a progressive, moral development in the soul of Jesus by which He appropriated the content of the life of the Godhead, and as God-man manifested and manifests His increasing unity with God in the prophetic, priestly, and kingly influence, considers the doctrine of the Trinity indispensable to theology, but of relative value for the attainment of personal salvation. Loofs bases his view of Jesus upon the economic, instead of the essential Trinity. His spirit, or His logos, which was His energizing power also at the creation, dwelt in the man Jesus in such a way that Jesus was both the unique Son of God who reveals the Father and the author of a new spiritual mankind. Exalted to the right hand of God, to a position of royal sway, He left His Spirit, the Spirit of God, in the community which He had established. The Spirit leads the way to the Son, and through Him to the Father, and when all the redeemed have been made perfect, the Spirit of God will fill all the children of God as it has filled the first-born among many brethren. The special

sovereignty of the latter will finally cease, as Saint Paul says: "Then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that subjected all things unto Him, that God may be all in all." (I Corinthians 15:28.)

Avoiding further inquiry into the doctrine of the Trinity, Loofs sums up his views in a threefold result: (1) The historical Christ as a human personality. (2) This personality, through an indwelling of God, or His Spirit, unique as compared with every one before and after Him, up to the end of time, became the Son of God, commissioned to reveal the Father and to make the beginning of a new mankind. (3) In the future state of perfection a similar indwelling of God must be realized, though in an ectypal and therefore secondary form, in all people whom Christ redeems. The conclusion is emphasized that in the idea of the indwelling of God's Spirit in Jesus we meet with the oldest formula which lies at the root of the story that Jesus was born out of the Spirit of God, at the root of the story of His baptism, at the root of the words on the cross, *Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit,* and many other statements recorded in the New Testament. He asks whether it is not true that the convictions of faith and the facts of historical research combine into an harmonious whole in the declaration of Paul concerning Christ, that *He was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power,* according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead (Romans 1:3).* Does

* Dr. Loofs, *What is the Truth about Jesus?* p. 237. Charles Scribner's Sons.

not historical research, remaining within its bounds, find itself compelled to recognize this formula as doing justice both to the human side and the superhuman self-consciousness of Jesus? He commends this formula to every layman as a sufficiently intelligible guide to conviction. God, through His Spirit, dwelt so perfectly in Jesus that the revelation remains supreme in human history, both in the past and in all time to come. Therefore we can find God in Christ when we pray to Him. But we do not understand what the Spirit of God is, for God Himself is Spirit. Hence we are again confronted with a mystery when we speak of the indwelling of God's Spirit in Jesus. Thus there might be room to question even the sufficiency of this formula for faith. Loofs therefore seeks refuge in the term employed by Paul in his Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, the mystery of Christ—that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. (II. Corinthians 5 : 19.) He says that we attempt the impossible when we try to understand the historical Person of Christ. Historical science is not able to do full justice to Jesus. The Jesus of history is the same as the Christ of faith, the man Christ Jesus, the originator of a new mankind, the Christ in whose face we behold the glory of God, who is our Saviour and our Lord. We can never tell how God made Him what He was. In Matthew's Gospel Jesus says that no one knows the Son, save the Father only; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him. (Matthew 11 : 27.)

Dr. Loofs, like all the Ritschlians, and like Ritschl himself, is unconsciously hampered in his critical labours by the Lutheran view of faith, and by the doctrine of justification by faith. But the New Testament Scriptures offer more than only a written testimony concerning the faith of the early Christian community. It is also a record of direct contact and fellowship with Jesus. The writers of the New Testament were not ignorant of the laws of evidence and of the value of eye-witnesses. Luke speaks of the believers of his time as eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word, and says that it seemed good to him also to write his Gospel, because he possessed a perfect understanding of all things pertaining to Christ, from the very beginning. (St. Luke 1 : 3.) From its inception the life of Jesus must have been different, metaphysically and ethically, from every other human life, unfolding as it did into a sinless self-consciousness. Loofs says that the scholars who acknowledge only a purely human life of Jesus are forced by their anti-Johannine interest to abide by the framework of Mark's Gospel, and that this is still more necessary when they come to the appearances of the Risen Lord, although Luke, too, reports appearances only in Jerusalem. Their presuppositions make impartial historical criticism of the Gospel of St. John impossible.* He does not consider their method to be correct. Therefore he himself does not approach an adequate and final solution of the Jesus-problem by rejecting the tradition of the Virgin Birth, and throwing the veil of impenetrable

* Loofs, *What is the Truth about Jesus?* p. 111. Charles Scribner's Sons.

mystery over the balance of the Saviour's personality and career. Loofs teaches that Jesus had a human personality, but that He possessed God's indwelling Spirit in a sense, in a measure, in fulness and perfection, as no man ever did before nor since, and never will again. At the same time we can never discover nor tell how God made Him what He was. Thus, as in Schleiermacher's criticism of the Synoptic genealogical tables, and the tradition of the Virgin Birth, one miracle is substituted for another, and faith, pinned to some primitive, generalizing, and professedly harmonizing formula, floats in midair. The Scriptures contain the record of eye-witnesses. The faith of the primitive Christian communities rested upon historic experience, knowledge of divine events, and verifying conviction. This is shown in the closing days of our Lord's life by the confusion, doubt, and utter hopelessness of the disciples when Jesus died, as contrasted with the joy they had had in following Him, and with the spiritual triumph which ensued when He rose from the dead, and the grave was found empty. The mystery is not only associated with the unfolding of the unique self-consciousness of Jesus historically, and in relation to faith, but also with His very origin, His beginning in this world, as part of the historic basis and background of the faith of the primitive Christian community. The original purpose of the Synoptic record (St. Luke 1:4), and of the Church in her first love and consecration, unspoiled by foreign admixtures of worldly ambition, heathen cultus, and priestly usurpations, was to encourage faith, and to strengthen

assurance by a testimony based upon historic evidence.*

There is a strange contradictory parallel between the critics and the Roman Catholic traditionalists. On the part of the former it is insisted that the distinction between the canonical and the apocryphal must be abandoned, and the whole testimony of the Gospel formative period submitted to the test of the same laws of evidence. In the latter case the Catholic Church rejects the Protestant position, which confines the working of miracles to the Gospel Age, and holds that the testimony of the Church on this subject must be accepted as an act of faith and in response to authority. This proceeding places the canon of Scripture, the Apocrypha, and Tradition almost upon the same plane. Thus by the one path different conclusions, objects, and ends are reached.

Tischendorf, with reference to the primitive historic authenticity of the Gospels, says: "We must begin with the one indisputable fact that in the last decade of the second century our four Gospels were known and acknowledged in all parts of the Church." This conclusion is supported by the testimony of Irenæus of Lyons, Tertullian of Carthage, Clement of Alexandria, the probable compiler of the Muratorian Canon, and the Peschito, the Syriac translation of the

*The Lutheran view of faith contains a sporadic principle. Luther taught that where two or three believers meet in Jesus' name, there is the Church. Hence his reformatory movement, in this feature of it, was separatistic. Owing to this peculiar phase of doctrine, the Ritschlians and the Modernists, from different points of view, construct a Jesus of faith who is neither the Jesus of the Synoptics nor the Jesus of history.

New Testament, citations from the Gospels and Epistles by Athenagoras (177), Dionysius of Corinth, Polycarp, and Ignatius, and by Justin Martyr in the *First Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho.* According to Irenæus, the writings of heretics in the primitive age of Christianity bear testimony to this universal acquaintance with, and use of, the canonical Scriptures. "So firmly are our Gospels established that even heretics bear witness to their authenticity, and every one of them bases his own doctrine upon them."

The Gnostic system of Valentinian as a whole is indebted for its terminology to the Gospel of St. John, and this dependence is so intimate that the enemies of the trustworthiness of the Fourth Gospel boldly describe it as a later product of the Valentinian system, which is an absurd theory. Citations from Matthew and the Gospel of John are found in the writings of Ptolemæus, a disciple of Valentinian, and Heraclion, another follower. The Montanists and their Johannine idea of the Paraclete, Basilides, Marcion, and Celsus (150), have a similar bearing upon the Gospels of Luke and John.

Tischendorf then reviews the New Testament Apocryphal literature, to complete the boundary line of the historical defence of the Synoptic Gospels. This literature has been neglected, he reminds his readers, and its study ought to be revived again, because of the additional light which is thrown thereby upon the authenticity of the New Testament traditions. To a degree it occupies a place midway between the literature of the Church and of the heretical

writers. At least many of the testimonies of the former serve the purposes of the latter. This is especially true of the *Protogospel* of James and the *Acta* of Pilate. A third writing, *The Gospel of the Childhood of Jesus,* may be added, though it lies nearer to the line of heresy. He argues that these writings possess primary value as proofs of the early composition of the canonical Gospels; that the Gospel of James and the *Acta Pilati* date from the first decade of the second century and have descended to us practically unchanged. Justin Martyr is the chief witness of its antiquity. *The Dialogue with Trypho* and his *First Apology* contain details concerning the birth of Jesus which are not limited to facts, but extend to textual elements not found in Matthew and Luke, and agreeing with the Gospel of James. Hence a profound and many-sided interest attaches to these literary monuments of early Christian antiquity.

The *Pseudoclementine* literature and the *Epistle of Barnabas* also must be listed supplementally in this classification, the latter especially, a very old copy of which was providentially discovered in a dark corner of an ancient cloister, and possesses inestimable value in its bearing upon the authenticity of Matthew's Gospel. Tischendorf contends that all this evidence proves conclusively that at the close of the first century the canon of the New Testament was universally regarded throughout the Church as complete, and that soon after the destruction of Jerusalem the four Gospels, besides the other writings of the apostolical period, were known, and that their authority was di-

rectly associated with the names of the several authors, for whom the congregations vouched as surety. With the passing of the authors, their writings became far more valuable and sacred, and served, after the emancipation of the Church from the Synagogue, to enlarge and complete the Old Testament canon. Moreover, in relation to the text, Tischendorf shows that already by the middle of the second century the four Gospels had unquestionably been translated into Latin and Syriac, and this, together with the *Harmonies* of Tatian and Theophilus, dating from about the same period, prove that the Gospels of Luke and John, Matthew and Mark, then already possessed the form in which we have them now. There is no evidence that these Gospels grew out of earlier texts through unknown hands, and in their altered unhistorical form were endorsed as original by the Latin Church.

The radical character of the two most famous biographies of Jesus, the one an air castle by Strauss, the other a caricature by Renan, establish the battle line between faith and unbelief very clearly, so this famous textual critic testifies. Thus the friends of Christianity have been awakened to the necessity of making a scientific study and defence of their religion in order to counteract the scepticism of a hundred years, and the widespread ill-advised conclusion that the early history of the Christian Church does not authenticate our Synoptic Gospels, and particularly the Gospel of St. John. It cannot be denied that among learned and ignorant alike this reign of doubt is a great triumph for unbelief. And yet one can find few examples of

such firmly attested trustworthiness as in the case of our four Gospels, in all the literature of the world, if one only makes earnest, honest inquiry, in truth and in fact.*

* Tischendorf, *Wann Wurden Unsere Evangelien Verfasst.*

# PART II

# THE FUNDAMENTALS OF FAITH

If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?
PSALM 2:3.

For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. I CORINTHIANS 3:11.

# I

## THE DEFINITION OF THE TERM

THOSE men are not sufficiently informed upon the subject who rest in the conclusion that Modernism in the Church of Rome to-day is a belated second edition of the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century; who bestow fulsome eulogies upon Loisy and Tyrrell, famous exponents of the cause; who pronounce heated, drastic, and unsparing condemnation upon the Vatican authorities because of the uncompromising resistance manifested toward the movement, and who speak with contempt of the anti-Modernist vow which has been exacted by the Pope,* through the bishops, from the priests in every diocese of the Roman Catholic Church. A great many persons who are unalterably prejudiced against that Church consider it to be their duty to endorse and further any agency or activity which seems to be antagonistic to her presence in the world, holding it to be justifiable and worthy of all acceptation to do this, simply because it promises to injure and to weaken still more that ancient and venerable Communion. Such an attitude of mind the Germans call *Schadenfreude.* It is indefensible, because it lacks definition and proper understanding. There is a sense in which the Roman Catholic Church and orthodox Protestan-

* Pius X.

tism are the best of friends, each one of the other, even though on both sides it is uncommon to acknowledge this to be true. For example, when Bishop Strossmayer, an eloquent Latinist, and the boldest opponent of Papal Infallibility in the Vatican Council, spoke favourably of the great Leibnitz and the honesty of Protestants, declaring that the latter condemned the errors of Rationalism as much as do the Catholics, he was interrupted by De Angelis, the President, who rebuked him by saying: "This is no place for praising Protestants." Midst an angry uproar which ensued, and cries of "Shame! Heretic! Damnamus!" he left the tribune, calling out three times, as he did so: "Protestor!—I protest!" The scene was memorable, but confused denunciation does not change a fact.* To condemn a thing without a hearing is not the way to ultimate truth.

Dr. Philip Schaff calls the stern and rigorous asceticism in which the noblest spirits of the Middle Ages sought justification before God, especially the Mystics and the anxiously pious Augustinian monks, the actual birth throes of the Reformation. He says that in Calvin, even in higher degree than in Luther, one sees everywhere the results of the strict legalistic discipline in thought and life which the Catholic Church, in spite of all the corruption of those centuries, still gave to at least the more earnest personalities within her fold. In our day it would be no longer possible, he thinks, to call forth groups of men of such keen intellect and strength of character as we meet with in the

* Gladstone-Schaff, *The Vatican Decrees, and History of the Vatican Council*, p. 64. Harper and Brothers, 1877.

Reformers. "The Reformation is the true child, the greatest act of the Catholic Church, and therefore correctly apprehended in its purity is on its own part catholic in spirit and aim. The Roman Church, instead of following the divine trend of history, continued to stick fast in the old legalism and children's shoes, like the Jewish hierarchy in the time of Christ, and by its crystallization as Romanism exchanged the character of true catholicity for that of particularity." * At the same time the two great religious communities, Catholics and Protestants, stand upon the same friendly footing in any case when faith and influence from both sides are directed toward the defence of primitive historic Christian revelation and Synoptic tradition.

This is exactly the situation in which the two Churches are involved, and the dilemma with which they are confronted at the present time, the one directly, the other indirectly. Dr. Benjamin W. Bacon gives a summary of the crisis in the following words: "What will result from the effort of Rome to carry its doctrine of sovereignty by divine right to the extreme of autocratic prescription of faith and practice? On the one side is the effort to resist all progress, and rigidly to limit the thought of Christendom to the theology of Aquinas. On the other side is the awakening spirit of revolt against all *jure divino* authority, but especially clerical authority. What will be the issue? Are the two hostile tendencies destined in the near future to precipitate an irrepressible conflict? Is the separation of Church and State, and the

* Dr. Philip Schaff, *Das Princip des Protestantismus*, p. 25.

secularization of education, that is sweeping over the whole continent of Europe, destined to produce a pagan generation, destitute of the high loyalties, the ennobling sentiments of religious faith?" *

Can orthodox Protestants, loyal to the Evangelical faith, and conservative in spirit and attitude toward the mighty problems of human thought and action in the form they have assumed in our era in history, enter with full sympathy into allegiance with those who in this country and in Europe contend for the adoption and establishment, in the Catholic Church, of the new world view? Modernism is a movement within the Roman Catholic Church which seeks and aims to force an adjustment between the Church in her medieval garb and the results of physical science and literary criticism. Back of, and associated with, both science and criticism there lies a philosophical theory, speculative and rationalistic in type. Modernism received its name from the Jesuit Fathers in Rome, and was adopted by the Pope and the Vatican authorities, who have combated it at every turn in the tide, first by excommunicating its leaders, men like Tyrrell, Mivart, and Loisy, then by papal encyclical, and finally by exacting a reprofession of faith from every priest actively engaged in the ministry.

In the ordinary affairs of life the Catholic Church seems to be lenient and grants a wide latitude to her people, as long as they observe the administrative regulations of the Church and lend obedience to her voice. For this reason many of her adherents sadly lack personal power to testify in faith and conduct to the

* *The N. Y. Independent,* December 1, 1910.

knowledge and grace of Jesus Christ. But in matters relating to doctrine and government she is exacting and watchful, and exercises the same relentless and uncompromising discipline that was meted out to Zwingli and Luther. She preserves her dogmatic and administrative solidarity and her form of worship, by means of repressive authority. It is not to be wondered at that Loisy and Tyrrell were excommunicated when for far less justifiable cause, as we see it, men of great faith and learning within her fold have been humiliated and forced into retirement.

One of the most remarkable instances of this kind is met with in the life of Count Ignaz Heinrich von Wessenberg, a noble representative of liberal Catholicism in Germany in the early part of the nineteenth century. He was appointed bishop coadjutor, *cum spe succedendi,* in the diocese of Rottenburg, over which Karl Theodore von Dalberg presided. Dalberg sprang from the nobility, was arch-chancellor of the German Empire, prince-primate of the Rhenish Confederacy, grand duke of Frankfurt, archbishop of Tarsus, an intimate friend of Goethe and Joseph II, and the *Mœcenas* of Schiller. As coadjutor bishop at twenty-six years of age, Von Wessenberg with the enthusiasm of youth instituted extensive reforms in the diocese. He improved the common schools. He sent the seminarists to Pestalozzi to study new methods of education, and founded clerical reading societies and conferences. He banished superstition and reduced the number of holidays, processions, and pilgrimages. He introduced choir and congregational singing, the use of the liturgy in German, and advo-

cated the establishment of a German Catholic National Church. Through the result of the period of illumination, the changes wrought by Von Wessenberg were emphatically in line with good order, ethics, and religion. He wrote a valuable history of the Ecumenical Councils in four volumes, and defended the superiority of General Synods to the Papacy. The Faculty of the University of Freiburg conferred the degree of doctor of divinity upon him. Because of the refusal of Rome to confirm his election as Bishop of Constance, he made a journey to the Vatican to plead his own cause, and felt great uncertainty for a long time whether he ought to promise full submission to the Pope, or not. He finally declined to yield to the command of the Vatican, and returned to Constance. Bishop Dalberg died in 1817, and the clergy of the diocese elected Von Wessenberg to succeed him, but the Curia curtly refused to confirm the choice, and also artfully disqualified the priest, whose ecclesiastical prerogatives were co-extensive with his earldom. This they accomplished by elevating the diocese of Freiburg, after the Pope had refused to appoint Von Wessenberg as its bishop, to an archiepiscopal see, which caused the dissolution of the diocese of Constance. Then his friends sought to prevail upon the Pope to give him the diocese of Rottenburg, but this movement also ended in defeat.

Hagenbach says: "When Rome concluded to dispose of a hated man, and ruin his work by the dismemberment of an episcopate one thousand years old, it was done." * Von Wessenberg died in retirement

* Hagenbach, *Kirchen-Geschichte,* Vol. IV, p. 11.

in Constance, in 1860, and was buried from the historic Cathedral, but not a single prelate or other Roman Catholic dignitary attended the funeral. A German priest, in a conversation concerning these incidents, said to me: "Those illuminati, Von Dalberg and Von Wessenberg, made us a dreadful amount of trouble. They wanted to reform everything."

The papal policy of repression is also exhibited in the treatment which was received from the Vatican by Leander (John Henry) van Ess and his cousin Karl, who were Roman Catholic progressives similar to Count von Wessenberg. Both of them were priests, and at the same time learned and devout students of the Holy Scriptures. They believed firmly that the laity ought to be given free access to the Bible, and encouraged to read and study the sacred volume. Dr. Leander van Ess was born in Paderborn on February 15, 1772. He entered the Benedictine Abbey of Marienminster in 1790, was ordained in 1796, left the priesthood in 1822, and died on October 13, 1847. With the assistance of his cousin, Karl van Ess, he translated the Old and New Testaments into the German language, and zealously distributed the Scriptures, especially the New Testament, among the people. He wrote extensively in defence of his views, and about the antiquity, binding importance, and indispensableness of the Bible. In the preface of a little volume entitled *Quotations from the Holy Church Fathers and Other Catholic Writers on the Necessity and Profitableness of Bible Reading* (Salzbach, 1816), he says: "My soul became filled anew with a living conviction regarding the value, usefulness, and neces-

sity of the reading of the New Testament, which is the Christian's statute and instruction book in religion, and a pure and sacred fountain from which he ought to drink daily. But gladly as I would speak to you on this subject out of the fulness of my heart, I choose rather to let others speak for me, and especially men whom we call Fathers of the Church, whom we revere as Saints, and who have contributed so greatly to the spread of the Holy Scriptures. These, and others, are to convince you how beneficial and necessary it is for the Christian to read the Bible himself, above all the New Testament, and that it is not sufficient to hear the same Gospel and Epistle lessons read and expounded from the pulpit on Sundays and holidays, year after year, over and over again, but that your duty to God remains unalterable to become better and better acquainted with the Holy Scriptures for the deepening of your faith. The Holy Spirit lives and moves in these sacred pages, and therefore they will all the more easily teach you how to read them, in order that you may also become partakers of the blessings of the Divine Word. And then, Christian brethren and sisters, when you have carefully read this little book through, you will be able to judge for yourselves whether the unspiritual Catholics are, or are not, permitted to read the Bible, not even the New Testament. You yourselves will think and say: 'Any one who believes and asserts such a thing is ignorant of the teaching of the holy Fathers, and of his Church, else he would not so flagrantly contradict them.' In this you would be right.

"The most of those who speak in such a manner

possess few, if any, of the valuable writings of the holy Fathers, and are not in a position to buy them, while others have neither the taste, the time, nor the opportunity to read them. Do not allow yourselves to be deceived by them. The testimony of the holy Fathers, set forth in this book, is worth far more. And you will certainly soon experience in your own hearts that those holy men spoke the truth, when you read the New Testament with love for the truth, with warm zeal for virtue, and with earnest effort to grow more pious, God-fearing, conscientious, resigned, humble, patient, and Christlike. For such, only for such fruits of my labour, my heart with the deepest longing and prayer to God utters the most burning *Amen.*"

The German translation of the New Testament by Leander van Ess, which was published in 1845, is one of the best ever made. It received the approval of the Kingdoms of Bavaria and Saxony, and the Republic of Switzerland. It was endorsed by the Prince Archbishop Sigismund of Vienna, by the Vicars-general of Breslau, Ellwangen, Hildesheim, Fulda, Constance, Aschaffenburg, and Brussels. Commendatory judgment was passed upon the work by the Theological Faculty of the Albertini High School in Freiburg, by the Royal University in Würzburg, and the Theological Faculty of the University of Tübingen.*

Leander van Ess cites a number of Roman Catholic

* Dr. Leander van Ess, *Die Heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments.* Sulzbach, in der Oberpfalz, 1815. See the title-page.

historians, the learned Du-Pin, Van Espen, Herzig, Vitus Pichler, and others, to show that the enactment of the Council of Trent, in the third session, forbidding the reading of heretical books, particularly the writings of Luther, did not include the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular, excepting when the translation was unauthorized by proper ecclesiastical imprimatur. This act of the Council of Trent is the first of its kind in the history of Christianity. It was called forth by the invention of printing, and the appearance of a great flood of literature more or less antagonistic to the reigning system of religious and civil government. A number of years prior to this event the Bishop of Mainz issued the first decree against printing, in the city in which Gutenberg gave the first copy of the Bible, made from movable types, to the German people. The Council of Trent, in the fourth session, on April 8, 1546, concerning the canon of Holy Scripture, renewed the inhibition forbidding any one to print the *Vulgate,* or other religious writings, or to have the same printed, to sell or to possess the same, without the name of the editor or publisher, and the imprimatur of the diocesan bishop, under pain of the penalties prescribed by the Lateran Council.

Some members of the Council of Trent objected to these penalties because they believed that every bishop was capable of exercising the necessary censorship, and others because punitive methods are a worldly procedure. The Bishop of Vitonto was applauded for his view that according to experience temporal punishments are more effective than spiritual penalties, because the wicked prefer the pleasures of

the flesh to the delights of the soul. The first list of forbidden books was drawn up by the Theological Faculty of Paris, in 1554, and the first list of this kind which had the sanction of law was the one promulgated in Spain in 1558 by Philip II. Subsequent to this decree, a much larger index was authorized in 1559 by Paul IV, and possessed a threefold classification: (1) the works of authors whose complete writings, also on secular subjects, were forbidden; (2) certain particular writings of authors whose remaining productions were not prohibited; and (3) anonymous writings, religious and otherwise, including every publication of that kind subsequent to the year 1519. Among these productions were many which did not touch upon the subject of religion and had been in the hands of the learned for hundreds of years, and there were some books among them which had been commended by former Popes, as, for example, the *Commentary on the New Testament,* by Erasmus, which was approved on September 10, 1518, in a brief by Pope Leo X.* The Bishop of Badajor suggested a fivefold classification of the Index: (1) heretical books, which were to be burned; (2) anonymous books, which were to be allowed when unobjectionable; (3) books of mixed content, which were to be expurgated; (4) translations of the Holy Scriptures into the vernacular, and prayer-books, which were to be forbidden or allowed, according to their character; (5) books on magic, black-art, and fortune-telling. In February, 1562, the Emperor, through his legates,

* Von Wessenberg, *Die Grossen Kirchenversammlungen des 15ten und 16ten Jahrhunderts.* Dritter Band, Seite 368.

Archbishop Muglitz of Prague, Sigmund of Thun, and Bishop George Drascowich of Hungary, admonished the Council of Trent to refrain from making plans for an adjourned meeting of the Council, lest they frighten the Protestants away before the sessions began. Moreover, because the Index of forbidden books prepared by Pope Paul IV included the *Augsburg Confession,* they requested the Council not to pass sentence of condemnation upon that Confession.*

The Fathers of the Council of Trent, it is plain to be seen, were not united concerning all the problems which confronted them, nor did they accept all the conclusions with perfect unanimity. Deep, serious, and ominous differences of view and policy existed among them. Some subjects were only lightly touched upon, others ended in compromise and generalization, and a few questions were excluded entirely from the field of discussion, and through the influence of the Pope, supported by his Italian friends, were not admitted to formal action by the Council. The doctrine of Indulgence was made less objectionable. The use of images in the churches received a more reasonable interpretation, and an effort was made to deal in a broader way than ever before, though perhaps under the impulse of a mistaken zeal, with certain sources and causes of harm and evil, like the unrestricted printing and distribution of all kinds of books and pamphlets.†

* Seite 373.

† Erasmus, in his *Enchiridion,* Can. 4, p. 401, says that the best rule is the conscientious decision whether one may hope for any gain, or not, to Christian culture from the reading of any particular book. "Know yourself," he writes, "and measure

Charles V wanted lay representation in the Council of Trent, and asked that the Protestants might be given an opportunity to be heard. He was not only a consistent devotee of the Catholic Church, but also a far-seeing statesman who recognized the rights of the great Protestant party in his realm, and wished both to conserve the unity of his empire and if possible to accomplish the reunion of Christendom. Pope Paul IV refused to grant the privilege and the Emperor became quiescent. Thus we may say that Charles V was responsible, in an appreciable measure, for the final triumph of the Evangelical faith.

A similar situation developed in relation to printing. The Council, guided by the principle of supreme authority in matters of Church and State alike, sought not only to prophesy, but also to legislate. The printing press was looked upon as an invention of Satan, and an instrument of destruction. The Council sought to protect public and private morality against the corrupting influence of obscene, superstitious, and sceptical literature. The action of the Council in the creation of the Index, in principle, if not in application, deserves commendation, apart from the Ultramontanism involved in it, as the first organized attempt to protect the common people against the danger of unrestricted literature. Nevertheless the mild concessions to reform were secondary to the pivotal object for which the Pope contended midst the tumult of the times. By means of every agency at his command he

yourself according to your powers. Less knowledge and more love,—this is the best."—Von Wessenberg, *Kirchenversammlungen,* Vol. III, p. 370.

resisted the encroachment of the Reformation movement, and did all that lay in his power to maintain and protect the hierarchical system, the independence of the priesthood, and the inviolability of priestly supremacy and function. Had Paul IV followed the counsel of the most Catholic Emperor Charles V, that lay representatives be admitted to the Council of Trent, and had the Protestants accepted the invitation, the face of Europe would have been changed thereby, and with it the character and current of the future.*

Moved by the same free spirit, Leander van Ess cites twenty-four introductions to Roman Catholic translations of the Bible, and many anonymous Catholic translations, to show that the Catholic Church does not oppose the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular, and to defend his own purpose and effort to distribute the Gospels among the Catholic laity. " In conclusion I have yet only heartily and fraternally to entreat my Protestant brethren to banish from the catechism and other books, as well as from their pulpits and schools, the untruth that Catholics are forbidden by their Church to read the Bible. Why is this done? It begets hatred instead of love. If in the middle of the last century (seventeenth) Michael Walter could write the book entitled *Demonstration that the Lutheran is the Only True and Saving Religion,* and the learned J. G. Walsh could write the preface for it,† then let us also in love forget that the

* James Anthony Froude, *Lectures on the Council of Trent*—Lecture VII. Charles Scribner's Sons.

† *Demonstratio, quod Religio Luterana sit vera uniceque salvifica. Jenæ, 1750.*

declaration of Quesnel in behalf of the Holy Scriptures, that it works harm to Christians to neglect the reading of the Bible, was condemned in the year 1713 by the equally human Clement XI, despite the fact that Quesnel's *New Testament,* according to Bassonet, bore the approval of the Sorbonne, and was exhausted more rapidly than one edition could follow another.* Let us unite in a brotherly way to correct old faults, and thus more faithfully imitate the One Chief Head of Christianity, the One Teacher of Love, and to encircle the great family of Christians more firmly with the beautiful tie of divine affection which He twined around His Church, and in which we all are brethren." †

Under these circumstances it seems very strange that, after his careful, trustworthy, and finished translation of the New Testament into the German language, in 1807, Dr. Leander van Ess met with stern opposition from Romanists, and was persecuted by them to such a degree, on account of his zeal in disseminating the Scriptures among laymen, that he finally, in 1822, resigned his theological professorship in the University of Marburg, and withdrew to private life. In the same year he published his translation of the Old Testament. After his death, his library, consisting of fifteen thousand volumes, including the

* Dies dominicus a Christianis debet sanctificari lectionibus pietatis et super omnia sanctarum scriptuarum. Damnosum est, velle Christianum ab hac lectione retrahere.

† Leander van Ess, *Auszüge über das Nothwendige und Nützliche Bibellesen aus den heiligen Kirchenvätern und andern Katholischen Schriftstellern.* Sulzbach, im Regenkreise Baierns, 1816. Seite 198.

one from the Abbey of Marienminster, and many important manuscripts of the New Testament, at the suggestion of Dr. E. Robinson, was purchased by the Union Theological Seminary in New York, and is exceedingly valuable.

## II

## THE ANTI-MODERNIST VOW AND PROTESTANT DIFFERENTIATIONS

FROM a suggestive and instructive digression we now return to the anti-Modernist vow. This vow contains four articles of faith: (1) the supernatural element in religion; (2) the divinity of Christ; (3) the founding of the Church by the Apostles; (4) the sacredness of the traditions of the Church. To the first three of these articles every earnest orthodox Evangelical pastor can subscribe. To the fourth article we cannot yield assent. The reason is that in the field of Patristic tradition and activity there exist so many doctrinal differences in the writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers and such glaring departures, in a number of instances, from Synoptic and Pauline teaching, that one cannot truthfully speak of "an unanimous consent of the Fathers" in the Roman Catholic sense of the words. Hence a consistent Protestant clings to the Bible, and honours Christian tradition only so far as it is dogmatically not at variance with Holy Scripture, and ritually to some reasonable degree at least in keeping with the worship of the Early Church.

Thiersch reduces ritual tradition to the simple institutions in cultus, discipline, and government which

were in existence in the Christian communities before the establishment of the canon of Holy Scripture, and dogmatic tradition to the apostolic symbol, with slight outward modifications. Both of these traditions were looked upon as being unalterable and unchanging.* Schenkel defines tradition to be essentially nothing else than the deeper apprehension, in effort and conflict, of the one eternal and unchanging Christian Truth, the historical development and glorification of the Truth.† One can readily see, therefore, that in the first three articles of the Papal anti-Modernist Vow we possess a restatement of essentials which are fundamental to the Christian faith everywhere, when correctly interpreted. The fourth article in the Vow, on the contrary, is the line of cleavage between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Any one who subscribes to it avows belief in papal absolutism, the hierarchy, transubstantiation, medieval miracles, indulgences, the worship of saints, auricular confession, the infallibility of the Pope, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and a great many other dogmas and religious practices not revealed in, or countenanced by, Holy Scripture, or even sustained by early Christian tradition. But that phase of Modernism which concerns itself with the task of liberalizing the Catholic Church dogmatically passes way beyond the limitations safeguarded by the first three articles of the vow, and renounces as far as possible the very semblance of a static expression of the Chris-

* H. W. J. Thiersch, *Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism,* p. 320.

† Dr. Daniel Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus,* p. 106.

tian faith, not only in its later scholastic conception, but also in its simple primitive Evangelical form, as set forth in the crucial articles of the symbol traditionally called the Apostles' Creed. Recent criticism, in line with Modernism, holds that this creed does not belong to the Apostolic or early Post-Apostolic age, and that because it fails to say anything of the Personal Fatherhood of God, of the Messiahship of Christ, the kingdom of God, repentance and faith; love for God and man; nothing of following Christ, though it mentions the Virgin Birth; nothing of the forgiveness of sins, or baptism, works of mercy and power, nor of the fulfilment of prophecy, and the coming of the kingdom through the witness of preaching, it is therefore primarily "a doctrinal and polemical creed, not an evangelistic or missionary symbol."

Dr. McGiffert, from whom we quote, claims that even in its earliest form it belongs to a time when the Catholic spirit was crowding out the primitive spirit, at the sacrifice of all interest in the evangelization and salvation of the world. At the same time he confesses that this symbol ranks above all other symbols in importance, all other creeds, that is to say, possessed by the Church, because it places in the foreground the historic figure of Jesus Christ. "Perhaps to it more than to anything else—more even than to the Gospels, which were not widely read in the Middle Ages—we owe the fact that Jesus Christ is and always has been the object of the Christian's faith, and that His figure has never been completely lost even when the true Gospel has been most overlaid with

scholastic philosophy or with sacramentarianism and ecclesiasticism." *

These conclusions concerning the origin of the Apostolic Creed are not true in every particular. They are contradicted by the fact that Jesus Himself, when He said: "My kingdom is not of this world," and "In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, for I have overcome the world," not only acknowledged but declared that His mission in its very nature antagonized irreconcilably the ancient order of the world and the wonted inherited religious beliefs of Jew and Gentile. Consequently, as far as we know, this symbol might just as logically have arisen immediately after the close of our Lord's ministry on earth as at some future period during the later conflict, for example, with the Gnostic heresies, antedating the Synod of Nicæa in 323 A.D. The conclusion seems to be hardly tenable that the early, the simple primitive creeds, grew out of the Church, and the Gospels out of the creeds.† It has always been the fixed and firm view of continental Protestantism that the Church grew out of the Gospel, oral and written, and that any creed, when fundamentally Biblical, is a confession of Gospel truth, resting upon inspired divine revelation. At the same time it must not be forgotten that the Catholic Church also recognizes the authoritative limitation of Holy Scripture. But she claims for herself the sole right of interpretation,

* McGiffert, *The Apostles' Creed,* pp. 35, 36. Charles Scribner's Sons.

† Dr. Bernard Weiss, *Introduction to the New Testament,* Vol. I. Funk and Wagnalls.

having given her dogmas a certain colour of Biblical conformity. Hence she denies any one the right, either publicly or privately, to read and expound the Scriptures in any other sense than in agreement with her dogmas.*

The Protestant theologians hold that this doctrine places the Church, in authority, above Christ Himself. But herein the attitude of the Reformers was twofold. Luther taught that anything in doctrine and cultus which does not directly contradict Holy Scripture is admissible. Zwingli, the Swiss Reformer, said that everything which is not directly authorized by Holy Scripture is forbidden. Max Goebel takes the ground that in the Reformed Church the Word of God is made the only rule of faith and conduct.† In the Reformed confessions the canonical books of Holy Scripture are named in their order, and a careful discrimination is drawn between the divinely inspired writings of the Bible and all merely human documents. In the Lutheran Church this distinction was never so carefully made, and hence even the Apocryphal writings were sometimes treated as God's "Word," a thing which was never done in the Reformed Church. In the latter, Old Testament texts were far more frequently used than in the Lutheran Church, and the Bible as a whole received such unquestioning veneration as to discourage and prevent the least semblance of criticism. Hence in the Reformed Church the confessions of faith were never regarded

* Dr. Julius Müller, *Dogmatische Abhandlungen*, pp. 43-65.

† Max Goebel, *Die Religiöse Eigenthümlichkeit der Lutherischen und Reformirten Kirche*, p. 124. Bonn, 1837.

as standing upon an equality with Holy Scripture. But in the Lutheran Church the confessions were called symbolical books, and were regarded as *normæ normatæ,* obtaining their authority from the Holy Scriptures, and deserving to be ranked side by side with them. They were held to be without error and to possess inspired authorship. In the Reformed Church the confession was not regarded as a rule, a norm, but as an expression or statement of faith *(confessio fidei).* The Anglican Church, though doctrinally more akin to the Reformed Church, in the matter of confessional obligation breathes more of the spirit of Lutheranism.

In the Reformed Church in Europe, more characteristically so than in America, great freedom was demanded and granted in the adoption of confessions of faith, and in some localities these were not recognized at all. Gaussen in his introduction to an edition of the *Helvetic Confession* (1819) says: "Our churches do not say to the teachers: Believe! They ask them: Do you believe? Rest not your faith upon any external authority, whether of man, or clergy, or church, or reformer. Away, away with all confessions of faith, and martyrs' testimonies, as soon as they are to be converted into authoritative norms of belief, to determine what must be accepted to obtain salvation, instead of being a simple, honest expression of that which one already believes." * This firm and definitive recognition of the sole authority of Holy Scripture explains the absence, in some Reformed Churches in Europe, of articles of faith. It accounts for the

* Max Goebel, *Die Religiöse Eigenthümlichkeit,* p. 122.

objection of many of the sects to symbolical literature. It throws light upon the apology of the Presbyterians in Scotland for the incorporation of the "uncanonical" Apostles' Creed in the catechism, and for the lack of any moulding influence from the confessional literature, in the theology of the Reformed Church as compared with the Lutheran Church. Luther's reformation in Germany was essentially a reformation of faith, a betterment of faith, a dogmatic reformation of the Church, based upon a particular principle of faith, with the aid of Holy Scripture, which for this reason became a positive norm for doctrine. In relation to ethics, cultus, government, training, and religious life in general, the attitude was negative, because everything that existed in the Roman Catholic Church which did not contradict Holy Scripture was retained, and the residue judiciously and conservatively changed. In the Reformed Church, on the contrary, the principle of absolute agreement with Holy Scripture was logically applied, and hence everything not directly authorized by the Bible was cast aside. Holy Scripture became the living fountain from which Christianity itself had to be fully renewed, according to the pattern of the original, the primitive, Apostolic Church, not only as a norm of faith, but also as an objectively binding norm in ethics, cultus, and government, and thus the Reformed Church represented and contended not only for a reformation in faith, but also for a reformation of the Church in the sense of a renovation of Christianity.

The manner and method of Luther were conservative, regressive, defensive, and gradual. The manner

and method of the followers of Zwingli and Calvin were radical, progressive, offensive, and actualizing. The Lutheran Church sought to apply the monarchical principle of resistance and stability. The Reformed Church followed the principle of action and readiness. The former always retained a churchly character. The latter almost wholly sacrificed the churchly temper and disposition, and kept only a purely Biblical form and atmosphere. Luther honoured Catholic tradition wherever it did not conflict with the principle underlying his phase of the Reformation. He emphasized this common heritage of faith from the past in his controversy with the Swiss, and appealed to his letter to Prince Albert of Prussia in 1532, in confirmation and justification of his position. The Swiss answered the harsh judgment and retort of Luther by saying: "We also believe ourselves to be Christians, even though in this particular we cannot follow Luther. Love, with faith in the Word of God, is more precious to us. Faith in the Scriptures we treasure and esteem most highly, and we search them and pray God to unlock them for us. Those matters which the Scriptures do not condemn we do not cast away." * The Swiss extended love and peace to Luther, but besought him not to press them away from the Truth that they had found.

The fact is cited by Goebel that in his correspondence with Bucer concerning the differences with the Swiss, Melanchthon also (July 23, 1530) appealed to his own conscience and the authority of the Church, instead of to the Word of God. "It does not seem

* Goebel, *Die Religiöse Eigenthümlichkeit,* p. 127.

beneficial to the State nor safe for my conscience that through me our princes should be burdened with your unwelcome dogmas, of whose correctness I can neither convince myself nor others contrary to the authority of the Church." Goebel contends that the Reformed Church emphatically and unconditionally rejected all churchly tradition, and ignored or failed to recognize the fact that by means of the tradition of the Church God's Word was handed down intact, and that for this reason, in such an atmosphere, Holy Scripture is regarded as a *deus ex machina,* an effect without a cause. He tries to establish the charge that, in view of this fact, the Reformed Church has not taken any account of the development of the Christian Church for fifteen hundred years, and proposes to cleanse and cure the corrupted Church by a fundamental return to the New Testament beginnings. Hence the Reformed Church is thoroughly Biblical, but at the same time utterly unhistorical, neither possessing nor caring to have any past or future in history, aiming rather to crystallize herself upon the origins of the Church as recorded in Holy Scripture. To these basic beginnings she ever returns, as alone worthy in God's eyes, and as an abiding regulative rule of faith and practice which always grants every member the right to demand that every Christian activity shall harmonize with Holy Scripture, and to shape things according to this standard, an attitude of mind and a method of procedure which lead directly to sectarianism.

Goebel, however, is not altogether correct in his conclusions and representation. It is true that the Reformed Church rejects Medievalism, and by elimi-

nating the erroneous practices of the Papacy reinstates, wherever possible, the teachings and practice of the Primitive Church, as recorded in the New Testament. The Reformed Church parted company with the Medieval Church because the latter refused to abandon the errors superadded to the original form of Christianity through the course of many dark centuries, and as the result of alien influences. This movement, therefore, is not sectarian, but Catholic in the truest sense of the word. From a strictly historical point of view, Medieval Roman Catholicism represents the greatest schism in the annals of Christianity, because of the gradual, but definitive defection from apostolic faith and life. Max Goebel holds that the Lutheran Church is less schismatic than the Reformed, because of the retention of certain traditional forms and practices which the Reformed Church rejects, or at least does not strictly observe. But the Reformed Church, on the other hand, lays greater stress than does the Lutheran upon the continuity and perpetuity of the sacred office of the ministry. The Lutheran Church follows quite a different, an independent, intermittent, fragmentary, sporadic, and decidedly subjective and congregational type of movement in organizing congregations, in the selection of pastors, in the ministry of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments.

## III

# TRUE CATHOLICITY AND THE INVISIBLE CHURCH

THE Old Testament throws light upon this difficult problem. The word Kahal ( קָהָל ) signifies the totality of the people of Israel, the congregation of Israel, as a nation of theocratic character, with redemptive purpose, aim, and destiny. Another Hebrew word, Aeda ( עֵדָה ), used as a synonym of Kahal, possesses the same meaning. Kahal is not an assemblage of persons called together for some specific object, but is understood to mean Israel in solidarity, inspired with a common life and purpose. In Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, *Kahal* signifies Israel in the sense of a divinely chosen and holy people. Elsewhere it is synonymous with Aeda, or synagogue, and later on with ecclesia, or the Church of the New Covenant, as growing out of and contrasted with the Church of the Old Covenant, as a dynamic conception. The Kahal is the theocratic Nation in tangible assemblage, or in its process of unfolding, increase, forthcoming, and emergence.* Consequently the Seventy transferred to the pagan Greek word, synagogue, the profounder conception of the Old Testa-

* Cremer, *Biblisch Theologisches Wörterbuch,* p. 471. Sixth edition, 1889.

ment, namely, the Israelitish nation-wide congregation in its theocratic historico-soteriological character.

Kahal is interchangeable with both synagogue and ecclesia. But when Israel as such rejected Messiah, the assemblage became the " synagogue of Satan," and the Apostles transferred the concept of the Kahal to the Greek ecclesia.* The totality of the fellowship of believers, all who are called by and unto Christ, all who find themselves in the fellowship and possession of his salvation, the totality of the followers of Christ, is the Church. It follows from the Old Testament idea and presupposition, and from Christ's own words, recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel, 16:18, that the local church, or congregation, is secondary to the Church universal. This basic exposition rests upon the Old Testament conception of the Kahal Jehovah ( קְהַל יְהוָה ), the congregation of the Lord, which became associated with the word Kahal ( קָהָל ) at the time of the Exodus, was transferred to ecclesia ( *εκκλησια* ) by the Seventy, and meant the whole body of the people, instead of any single local group of persons.† It signified Israel as a whole, theocratically consecrated to God by circumcision and the Passover. Ebrard teaches that this conception carried into the New Testament, and associated with ecclesia, includes all who are bound together by baptism and the Holy Supper.‡ It is the fellowship of all who profess faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thus con-

* Cremer, *Biblisch Theologisches Wörterbuch,* p. 70.

† Exodus 12:3; 16:2.

‡ Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik,* Vol. II, p. 392.

stitute the New Testament Covenant-People of God.* But this fellowship is not identical with the "Kingdom of God" (*βασιλεια τοῦ θεοῦ*) for the New Testament Kahal is only the means to transmute protoadamic into deuteroadamic mankind.

The Church is twofold in character. In the first place it is the company of the regenerate, and in the second place, the means to convert the unregenerated, and to conquer the old Adam in the regenerated. The Church is both gathering and gatherer. At the end of all things, when the kingdom of God becomes supreme, the Church will cease to be a gatherer, and forever remain the assembly of the redeemed. The Church is not historically visible under a visible overlord, or in the unity of some particular visible organization. The Reformers of the sixteenth century were right in declaring the Church in this sense to be invisible. It does not apply to sectarians, who focus everything in an unseen, internal, psychical event or happening. The invisible church rests upon the sacrament of baptism, which is an external and visible act, and the sign of membership in the one Church instituted by Christ. The world is protoadamic mankind. The kingdom of God is perfected deuteroadamic mankind. The Church is the visible historic fellowship in which protoadamic passes into deuteroadamic mankind. The kingdom of God is the realm of the fruits of grace. The Church is the sphere of the means of grace and its conditioned activities. The Church is the sphere of the activity of the Holy Spirit as the

*Matthew 16:18; Acts 9:31; Romans 16:23; I Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 1:22; 3:10.

finisher of faith, and the kingdom of God is the completed result of the same. The kingdom of God consists of all who have been regenerated, converted, and perfected. The Church comprises actual human beings in whom, on the one hand, the hope still lives that they may be converted, and who, on the other hand, still need help and final perfection.* If by the *coetus sanctorum* we understand the multitude of the truly converted, then in this sense it is correct to say that the assemblage of believers undoubtedly bears the character and presence of invisibility.

Moreover, the Church as *mater fidelium* is not governed by the universal necessity of subdividing into different communions, outwardly organized, every one of them claiming to be the true and only saving church. This claim may be conceded to be logical enough when the confession of any such communion meets the conditions of the Gospel and is consistent and pure.† Jesus Himself established a very definite means of externalization, and has not left it to the "invisible church" to determine the manner and frequency of its visible actualizations. Baptism, an outward act and ceremony, is the mark of the one visible communion instituted by Christ, and this communion is the one true and only possible church within which there may be purer or impurer developments of dogma, giving rise to different confessions, but not to "churches," so that one of them, as compared with all the others, may lay claim to the prerogative of

*Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik,* Vol. II, pp. 389, 390.

† See I John 4: 1-12.

being the only true church. The Church does not rest upon the doctrine of the sacrament, but upon the sacrament itself. The one visible fellowship, that is to say, visibly bounded communion, of all who have been baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is both the *coetus sanctorum*, the fellowship of those born again, and the *mater fidelium*, the mother of believers, because thus, through her, new members, or units of faith, are constantly being brought under the power and influence of the means of grace.*

We know, Dr. Ebrard further says, that the institution of the holy sacraments has called forth a fellowship in which the invisible, inner, eternal relation of Christ, through grace, to the individual redeemed believer is intimately connected with the visible, historical relation of the redeemed to one another. Hence it follows that believers must dispense the means of grace to one another; that Christ acts through, and not independently of, these means of grace, and that the obedient use of them determines their efficacy. The means of grace are, therefore, *conditio sine qua non* for salvation itself. The relation of the individual to the Church as the dispensary of the means of grace is *sine qua non* for his salvation, but the means of grace are not the *causa efficiens salutis*. It is the Triune God alone who operates in and through the means of grace. As the initial step in this operation

*This view of the Church as gathering and gatherer is set forth by Haefling in his *Principles of Evangelical Lutheran Church Government*, and is endorsed and further elaborated by the Reformed theologian, Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, in his *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. II, p. 393.

depends upon and is conditioned by the means of grace, so, in like manner, the result of it is conditioned by the subjective attitude of the individual, in the direction of belief or unbelief.

Therefore two forms of error are possible. The first is the maintenance of the necessity of the means of grace and the historic, visible communion, or Church, without the real fruits of grace, the actual faith of the individual. In this case the means of grace and the visible communion which dispenses them are changed, *opere operato,* from a *conditio salutis* into the *causa salutis,* and one's salvation does not depend upon the relation of one's heart to God, upon repentance and faith, but entirely upon one's attitude toward the Church as the dispensary of the means of grace. Hence Roman Catholicism emphasizes chiefly the element of visibility, as carrying with it the invisible element of salvation. The second form of error makes subjective conversion the *conditio salutis,* and the indubitable source of the fruits of grace, without the presence or necessity of the means of grace, administered through the indispensable avenue of the historico-visible communion, which is overlooked or set aside. In this case the certainty of salvation rests upon personal conversion and subjective faith. The Separatist, however, does not possess the slightest intimation of the fact that this subjective faith could never have been awakened without Christ's Word, which itself, moreover, in written form, could never have been handed down to us from the Apostolic Age, without a Communion that livingly transmitted it as living, by letting it ever live anew within her

pale, and by ever living herself into it again in such a way that conversion corresponded with the objective impartation of Christ, with the help of the sacraments, for the implanting and feeding of a new man. To all this the Separatist is indifferent. He tramples his mother under foot, calling her "Babylon the Great," and where a little group of persons like himself, believing themselves to be truly converted, meet together, there a church springs into being. The historico-visible Communion is here left out of account, and only the moment of the invisible, inner heart relation of the individual to Christ is emphasized. But both errors, Ebrard says, characteristically deify the creature.

In the Roman Catholic Church the means of grace, through which the Holy Spirit seeks to operate, are made self-operative, and the churchly organs of the means of grace are fully identified as *causæ efficientes salutis*. Separatism, on the other hand, regards the fruits of grace as absolute. A sharp line of demarkation is drawn between believers and unbelievers. "Believers" no longer have in them any worldliness, any particle of the old Adam, or any impenitence, and the "unbelievers" do not come within reach of the possibility or beginning of conversion. In the latter case man deifies himself, and in the former he deifies the visible institution or organism of the Church.

The Christian Church, like the flame of a lighted candle, possesses a twofold nature, is both cause and effect. Every local congregation is organized and reaches religious consciousness through an already existing charismatic office. Then among its members

new dispensers of the means of grace are constantly raised up by the Holy Ghost and equipped for the conversion of others. The first is the *coetus sanctorum,* and the second the *mater fidelium.* Thus in these two fundamental functions of her existence the Church possesses the divine attribute of polarity. It is ever true that the Church grows up out of faith, and that faith comes from the Church. This one, identical and perpetual communion is both gathering and gatherer. The failure to recognize this essential polarity of the Christian Church is the first and fundamental form in which the two radical errors that have been described become visible. The Papacy, which makes the attitude of the individual to Christ, and all salvation, depend unconditionally upon the relation of the individual to the Church as institutionally in control of the means of grace, conceives the Church to be the fountain of grace, the mistress of salvation, the *mater fidelium.* Thus the Church, as the medium and dispensary of salvation, in the form of a priesthood, is differentiated from, and elevated above, the congregation. "The Church saves." The Church and the pastoral office are merged into one, and construed as a second mediator, a mediator between Christ and the individual. "Faith comes from the Church." Separatism, on the other hand, undervalues and ignores the necessary existence of the one historic Communion, the Church as established by Christ, and historically mediatorial in the churchly constructive communication of the means of grace, but gives the Church a new beginning whenever a group of believers meet and organize a congregation for purposes of wor-

ship and religious fellowship. Here the Church is conceived to be merely a congregation, a *coetus sanctorum,* a body of sanctified believers. Hence the historical union with the *mater fidelium,* the universal Church, is easily severed. The Separatist does not believe that he needs a *mater fidelium.* According to him the Church is involved in the process of being saved, and sporadically springs forth from the subjective act of faith.

These distinctions are clearly drawn. The first error must be banished by inculcating the fundamental truth that the Church does not save, but only makes it possible for men to come to the knowledge of a saving faith. The correction of the second error depends upon the inculcation of another fundamental truth, namely, that the Church herself is not undergoing salvation, but that those who have been and are being gathered into her fold possess and enjoy the means of grace, and all that is necessary for their salvation.*

Luther and his followers, partly because of the settled hatred of priestly usurpations and domination, and in striking contrast with their retention of many of the traditional customs of the Medieval Church not forbidden in Holy Scripture, with very little modification adopted the congregational theory of church government, and based it upon the doctrine of the invisible church, first enunciated, in Reformation times, by the Swiss reformer, Ulrich Zwingli. The distinguished German evangelical theologian, Dr.

* Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik,* Vol. II, pp. 403, 404.

Julius Müller, in a wonderful series of lectures on the invisible church, teaches that the framework of the visible church, reverenced and maintained as necessary and unchangeable, turns the minds of men away from the inner and essential, and binds them to the outward expressions of religion, thus hindering instead of aiding the extension of the spiritual life. Hence the idea of the invisible church becomes an untiring goad to the deep tendency of our nature to substitute the flesh for the spirit, and to accept the visible structure of ecclesiasticism, its ordinances and institutions, as unconditionally binding, but erected in reality to please the *vis inertiæ* of human nature, or to satisfy the impatience of unbelief. When the means of grace which are active in the visible church wholly assume the form of plenary powers, placed under the command of the organs of the Church, and when the Church makes fellowship with Christ dependent upon obedience to her dogmas, decrees, ordinances, and offices, the unadulterated reformatory protest arises: Where justifying faith in Christ is found, there is the Spirit of God. Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, the body of Christ, and with it all grace and salvation. We fully understand that this protest must be distasteful to those who wish to possess something permanent and unalterable in the confessions, cultus, and government of the Church, and aspire after abiding conclusions and convictions when nothing will be questioned any longer. They think that it would be right and proper for Protestantism, which originated from an ecclesiastical revolution, to abandon this principle of individualism, of personal self-de-

pendence, and to become reconciled to the principle of legitimacy. It is also true, as long as the idea of the invisible church asserts itself with any import, that Protestantism will never develop an imposing ecclesiastical organization such as Roman Catholicism has created, because a similar result could not be attained except by unconditional surrender to one central seat of human authority in religious affairs. If we cannot have even the protection of the State in union with the Church, without the denial of evangelical truth, we must simply relinquish the support of the civil power.

As long as the Evangelical Church remains upon the foundation of the Divine Word, so long it will be impossible for her, both formally and materially, to abandon the idea of the invisible church. The personal relation of the Evangelical Christian to Holy Scripture as the highest source and only norm of religious knowledge and instruction establishes a personal relation to Christ Himself, over which, with its further consequences, the authority of a visible church cannot exercise any ultimate and decisive control. Moreover, the content of Evangelical doctrine is not justification by works, which also includes obedience to external ecclesastical authority, but alone by faith in Jesus Christ, and this essentially embraces the idea of the invisible church. Therefore among the Apostles, the Apostle Paul especially, the preacher of justification by faith is the exponent of this idea. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (Book VIII, c. 33) very emphatically ascribe to him the defence of lay teaching in the assemblies, and quote his own words: "They all shall be taught of God." Both in doctrine and in

the events of his life Paul is the witness of this idea. His apostolical activity lacks all outward legitimacy, and in reality he studiously condemns it. He was not with the Apostles during the time when Jesus personally instructed and guided them.* He did not receive his Gospel from any man, but it came to him by revelation directly from Jesus Christ.† And when through God's grace he was called from darkness to light, he did not receive his ordination to the apostolate from any Apostle, but like an Old Testament prophet declared his mission everywhere. His certificate of authority is the power of the Holy Ghost working in and through him.

For this reason it has never been possible for the ecclesiasticism of the unbroken succession and external legitimacy to discover any trace of itself in this Apostle. The soul of his life and teaching has remained hidden, and when his great thoughts begin to live again in the minds and hearts of men, they rise up with bitter accusation against that ecclesiasticism, as the essentials of a searching and mighty reformation, and shake it to its very foundation. For these reasons Dr. Julius Müller warned and exhorted the religious leaders of that era (1870), who were contemplating a priestly, an hierarchical reconstruction of the Protestant Church, to weigh the question well, how they would silence the living voice of the Apostle of Protestantism.‡

* Acts 1 : 21.

† Galatians 1 : 12.

‡ Dr. Julius Müller, *Dogmatische Abhandlungen,* pp. 400-403. Bremen, 1870.

The Chevalier Bunsen, who had spent a number of years in

This study of the philosophy of the Reformation of the sixteenth century would be incomplete in its analysis and comparisons without at least a passing reference to the Genevan Reformer. John Calvin, historically, stands between, and in a sense above, Zwingli and Luther. Though doctrinally more closely allied to the Swiss Reformed people, he did not fancy the hero-worship which was paid to Zwingli, and deplored the dictatorial bearing of Luther. The strong nationalism manifested both by the Swiss and the Germans estranged him. This attitude of mind was distasteful to him because he believed it to be harmful to the great reformatory movement in the Church. He recognized the importance of the services rendered by both Luther and Zwingli, but his vision extended beyond the confines of particular provinces and nations. He fixed his gaze upon the world at large, and advocated the inculcation of the fundamental universals of the Gospel, in order that upon this groundwork the Christian world might again be unified into one vast army of believers and marshalled to battle for the Lord, for the achievement of a higher order of faith, worship, and life, than any ever before known among Christians. He plead for the abandonment of secondary and non-essential differences, and for the cessation of immaterial doctrinal feuds and divisions, that Evangelical Christians as a whole might manifest the union, fraternity, fellowship, and united action,

England, at the Court of St. James, later on became an enthusiastic exponent of Episcopacy in Germany. The language also contains a warning against the Roman Catholic revival of 1870 and later.

in the bonds of peace, which ought to characterize believers in the one Gospel, and the possessors of the one evangelical faith.*

"The soul of the Church," says Zahn, "is her doctrine, her confession, and since every word, sentence, and article were to him full of the greatest significance, the whole life-work of Calvin had in view the purity and completeness of that confession. The glorious fact about the Reformation is that after Luther had rediscovered the great fundamental truths of Grace and the Forgiveness of Sins, and then erred in relation to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Calvin appeared upon the scene, and with the hand of a master, carried through to its logical conclusion, and perfected the organic structure of, Reformation doctrine. He who knows all the teachers of the Reformation preceding him becomes the great systematizer and organizing genius of the Evangelical movement, and sheds light and truth everywhere. Calvin's *Confession* is the rounded sum of all the results of the Reformation. In the catechism, the *Confessio Gallicana,* which he prepared, all these final results lie immediately before the vision, and the first vital duty of the Evangelical Church alone can be to preserve and promulgate them. One sadly errs when one imagines that any progress can be made beyond them." †

The popular prejudice against Calvin and his theology, which will probably always exist to some extent, rests upon a misapprehension of the fundamental doctrines of the Calvinistic system. Calvin viewed Chris-

* Dr. E. Stähelin, *Johannes Calvin,* Vol. I, pp. 199, 207.
† Dr. Adolph Zahn, *Johannes Calvin,* p. 30.

tianity from the standpoint of God's Sovereignty, and Luther dealt with the Gospel from the viewpoint of human needs. These two fundamental theological conceptions are complementary of, and complete each other. But in the field of church government and organization, Calvin was far more constructive than Luther. Dr. Julius Müller, in his magnificent characterization of the Pauline faith and theology, based upon Galatians 1 : 12, seems to disregard the ordination and commission of Paul by the laying on of hands in the church at Antioch, in response to the voice of the Holy Ghost, where, as a teacher, Saul had become subservient to organized Christianity, following his wonderful conversion, and his call to the apostolate through the glorified Redeemer. For reasons not explicitly stated in the New Testament records, but which are self-evident, Saint Paul, after his abandonment of the Jewish religion, avoided the city of Jerusalem. His letter to the Galatians contains intimations that the charge of bribery made against him to explain his defection to Christianity led him to return to Tarsus from his retreat in Arabia, and after his precarious sojourn in Damascus, excepting fifteen days spent in Jerusalem with the Apostle Peter, to equip himself there, in his native city, for his future labours, and to await the further unfolding of his mission.

While Paul tarried in Tarsus the church of Antioch was born, and the mother-church in Jerusalem sent out Barnabas as the first teacher of the Antiochian disciples. The field grew wider under his care, and the church increased in faith, in zeal, and in numbers.

The task overwhelmed him. He needed assistance and went to Tarsus to seek Saul, his friend of former years, far abler than himself, and whom he knew to be well equipped in learning and character to instruct the heathen. Saul, whose zeal was an example to all, and whose peculiar mission had been miraculously declared, recognized the voice of God in the challenge of Barnabas, and accompanied him to Antioch. Not long after this event the Holy Spirit directed them to preach the Gospel throughout the Gentile world.

It is the view of Lechler that one or another of the Christian prophets in Antioch, humanly speaking, served as the organ of the Holy Spirit to call Barnabas and Paul into a wider field.* The congregation became conscious of the prerogative and received the divine command. The local church authorized the mission and ordained Barnabas and Paul by the laying on of hands. The call came directly from Jesus, but the organ of its transmission and fulfilment was the assemblage of believers in Antioch, who merely gave outward expression to the inner gift and purpose of the Redeemer of men and the Head of the Church. Thus the great Apostle to the Gentiles received his commission originally from the Lord, but it was translated into life and action by the church of Antioch, a living, organic part of the Church Universal. Paul speaks of certain divisions of sentiment in the Early Church, and recognizes the strong influence of the chief exponents of those tendencies, but nowhere does he exhibit a spirit of partisanship and provincial nar-

* Dr. G. V. Lechler, *Acts of the Apostles,* Lange's Commentary, p. 183.

rowness, nor does he give any indication of a deep and hopeless cleavage in fundamental apostolical teaching. By declaring that Apostles, and that teachers like Apollos and Cephas, are one in Christ, he disproves the existence of any antagonism between himself and Peter.* These generalizations reveal the presence of a Christian world view in the mind of Saint Paul. Back of the various leaders and their followers lies the unity of faith in Christ, the thread of the historic Church, and the fellowship of true believers.† Jesus declared that the harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few, and added: "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth labourers into the harvest." ‡ At another time He said: "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves." || To His disciples He gave the following promises: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me," § and: "Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." ¶

Thus it is clear that the witnessing mission and teaching authority of the Church must not depart from, but are divinely limited by, the transcendent

* Dr. G. V. Lechler, *Das Apostolische und Nachapostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 234, 235.

† I Corinthians 3:22; I Corinthians 15:11.

‡ Matthew 9:38.

|| Matthew 10:16. Compare Luke 11:49.

§ John 15:26.

¶ John 20:21.

authority and doctrine of Christ, sealed by the Holy Ghost. As has frequently been the case in the past, so now, and in a sense unknown to Apostolic, Post-Apostolic, and Medieval Christianity, in character almost entirely determined by the theory of evolution and a theory of cognition, an attack is being made upon the Church's norm of faith, the citadel of Holy Scripture, and the historic beginnings of Christianity. This movement has been under way for more than half a century, is vast in its proportions, and far-reaching in significance for all Christians who truly love the Lord Jesus Christ.

## IV

## FORMS OF MODERNISM

GIOVANNI LUZZI, an Italian exponent of the movement, in his classification of the Modernists, names five main groups among them.* The first is composed of churchmen who deplore the growth of the worship of images and relics, more especially the worship of the Virgin Mary, at the sacrifice of the honour and reverence which ought to be shown, from their standpoint, in deeper and truer piety, to the Holy Eucharist, "the sacrament of the altar." But the efforts of these men, among whom are a number of bishops, arise and die out again in a sporadic manner, and accomplish very little toward improvement.

A second group is composed of men who are daringly reformatory in their demands, bitterly opposed to Ultramontanism, compelled to write under fictitious names to protect themselves against humiliation, aiming at an intellectual renovation of the Church, and the abandonment of old canons of criticism and methods of exegesis, wherever these are at variance with the sober results of modern scientific research. They say the renovation must come from above downward, and propagate itself in the lower ranks of the Roman

* *The Hibbert Journal,* "The Roman Catholic Church in Italy," January, 1911.

Catholic family. It must come through intellectual enlightenment, they declare, and according to Prezzolini, in his *Red Catholicism,* when one asks the Modernists where the disease of the Roman Catholic Church, which they say is sick, lies, they answer: "In the head," and when one asks them again what remedy they propose to apply, they answer: "A library." They wish to lead back the flock of Christ, by means of this intellectual reform in the Church, to the spirit of the Gospel. The design of this group of Modernists reminds one in some measure of the futile plan of Erasmus, in Luther's day, to reform the Church "in head and members." But that warfare was distinctly moral in aim, and though Erasmus could not be induced to espouse the cause of Luther openly and unequivocally, he did nothing to stay the storm of righteous indignation and reformation that was sweeping over Europe.

Then there is another group whose purpose has nothing to do with dogma or literary criticism, but whose interest is social, benevolent, humane, and democratic in aim. These men labor to establish a Christian democracy in the world, so that there may exist less inequality among mankind in the enjoyment of all legitimate material advantage and blessing. Nevertheless, wherever, among Catholics, this movement assumes a more pronounced socialistic tendency and form, it shows itself to be antagonistic to the ecclesiastical authorities, and even to some of the cardinal teachings of Christianity. The writer knows this to be true, through personal acquaintance with a number of Socialists who were born and reared in

staunch and excellent Catholic families, and themselves belong to the Church loosely or vaguely, but look upon both Catholic and Protestant believers in the historicity of the Bible as victims of credulity, and unsparingly denounce the Roman Catholic Church for her age-long political corruption, her alliance with vested property rights, with the so-called "money power," and her tyranny.

Ever since the abolition of lay investiture by Pope Gregory VII in 1078, the Catholic Church has with persistent tenacity asserted priestly supremacy and guidance in all the important relations of life and society, and where this power was denied or taken away from her, she did not cease to lay claim to the prerogative. The social democratic movement in the Catholic Church asks for perfect freedom of action, and resents the demand of the Vatican that in a parish the priest, in a diocese the bishop, and in the Church at large the Pope, shall be at the head of all the centres of this movement. And this is the barrier which has been interposed between the Church and the social-democratic organization, and will either cause it to disintegrate or lead to the quiet withdrawal of its adherents and their sympathizers from the Church.

Again another group plead for a return to spiritual life and for the awakening of deeper piety through a widespread circulation of the Gospels and a more direct personal contact with the Word of God. Luzzi calls them "the Practical Modernists," but a more suitable name for them would be: the *Bible Modernists*. On April 27, 1902, in keeping with the purpose, there was organized: "The Pious Society of St. Gerome

for the Spreading of the Holy Gospels," which immediately prepared and placed in circulation a new translation, with Old Testament references, and in pocket form, of the four Gospels and the Acts. Over two hundred bishops approved the book in writing, and the Pope placed his imprimatur upon the Society's activity, granting an indulgence of three hundred days to all the faithful who would read the Gospels for at least fifteen minutes once a day. Three hundred thousand copies were distributed in three years. In 1907 the 880th thousand of the small volume was issued from the Vatican printing press, and in 1908 the number reached nearly one million. Earnest and enthusiastic preparation was being made to print the whole of the New Testament in similar form, and to push the distribution of it everywhere. The Society held its meetings in the Vatican, and a Cardinal presided over its deliberations. But the evangelistic character of the encouraging results which unexpectedly began to appear in increasing degree led the Curia to cripple the Society and its labours, and put the whole noble plan out of commission by prudently devised and unexplained obstructions and neglect, ending in the dissolution of the Society. An Evangelical Protestant Christian who loves his Bible cannot understand and does not endorse this strange attitude of the Papacy toward the Word of God. And yet it is in keeping with her traditional doctrine, or dogma, concerning the relation of the Church to the Scriptures in her office of final interpreter and arbiter.*

The fifth group, the higher critics, more im-

* Dr. D. Schenkel, *Wesen des Protestantismus,* p. 103.

mediately concern us in the present treatise. They are in reality, among all the innovators who to-day threaten the peace and harmony of the Catholic Church, the true Modernists, if there be any such thing at all, strictly speaking. Among them, and associated with them in the Protestant fold, are some of the greatest and most gifted Biblical scholars of our time, Roufiac, Monod, Bertrand, Murri, P. Loyson, P. Loisy, Canderlier, Rabby, Stefano, Girau, Vulliety, Maystre, Reyss, Montet, Gonell, Desjardins, Gregory, Funk, Bacon, and others. The writer does not mean to imply, for he does not know, that all the men here named agree to the utmost with Loisy's hypercritical, radical, and dangerous conclusions.

There has been secured for the use of this particular group of Modernists, as a retreat, all that remains of the old Cistercian Abbey of Pontigny, in the village of the same name, eighteen miles southeast of Auxerre, in France. This abbey was founded in the middle of the twelfth century, and at one time in its history was occupied by not less than five hundred monks. In 1164 Thomas à Becket, and in 1208 Stephen Langton, who lies buried beneath the church, found an asylum there, with the principal English bishops. In 1240 Edmund Rich, archbishop of Canterbury, lived in retirement there for two years, and his shrine was visited by many pilgrims during the Middle Ages. In 1568 this magnificent abbey was burned by the Huguenots, but one side of the cloister and the vast underground apartments remained intact. The Dominicans rebuilt and enlarged it, but had to abandon it on account of the political upheavals and the Catholic defections in

France. For a while it was occupied as a retreat by a small body of English priests of scholarly tastes and habits, the Brotherhood of St. Edmund, who in their turn had to abandon the abbey as the result of anti-clerical demonstrations and measures on the part of the French Republic. Since then M. Desjardins, a Modernist writer and a man of means, with the sympathetic help of his wife, has purchased the abbey and grounds from the Government, cleaned and improved the place, and has founded: The Union for Truth,—"L'Union pour la Vérité." Here periodically men from all parts of the world, some of them excommunicated from the Church of Rome, who, in their own way, according to their conclusions, experience, and ideals, hope for a spiritual awakening, and an earnest forward movement, liberal, reformatory, progressive, rejuvenating, and, as they interpret it, truly Catholic, in the bosom of "Mother Church," congregate to fellowship together in the spirit of Christ, walking, talking, seeking refreshment, and praying under the ruined arches of the historic abbey.

In Fogazzaro's famous Modernist romance, *Il Santo,* Benedetto, sinking upon his knees, is made to say to the Pope:*

"I have read this very day, great words you spoke to your former parishioners concerning the many revelations of the God of truth in Faith, and in Science, and also directly and mysteriously in the human soul. Holy Father, the hearts of many, of very many priests and laymen, belong to the Holy Spirit; the spirit of falsehood has not been able to enter into

* Antonio Fogazzaro, *The Saint,* p. 336. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

them, not even in the garb of an angel. Speak one word, Holy Father, perform one action which will lift up those hearts, devoted to the Holy See of the Roman Pontiff! Before the whole Church honour some of these men, some of these ecclesiastics, against whom the spirit of falsehood is striving. Raise some to the episcopal chair, some to the Holy College! This also, Holy Father! If it be necessary, counsel expounders and theologians to advance prudently, for science, in order to progress, must be prudent; but do not allow the Index or the Holy Office to condemn, because they are bold to excess, men who are an honour to the Church, whose minds are full of truth, whose hearts are full of Christ, who fight in defence of the Catholic faith! And as your Holiness has said that God reveals His truths even in the secret souls of men, do not allow external devotions to multiply, for their number is already sufficient, but recommend to the pastors the practice and teaching of inward prayer."

Nevertheless, *Il Santo,* Fogazzaro's romance, was placed upon the Index, as, in like manner, excommunication was meted out by the Vatican to Mivart, Loisy, and Tyrrell. Loisy is the chief representative among the French clergy of Modernist higher criticism. Father Hogan, an Irishman (1829-1901), who taught theology for more than thirty years in the seminary of Saint Sulpice, in Paris, and who more than any other single mind, during that time, moulded the training of favoured men among the French clergy, by some is called the founder of Modernism. In 1884 he was sent to Boston to found a seminary of the Sulpicians, and taught for a while in the Catholic University in the city of Washington. Rector Batiffol, headmaster of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, the Arch-

bishop of Albi, Mgr. Mignot, and De Rossi were active as precursors of Modernism, and to meet them Pope Leo XIII issued his encyclical *Aeterni Patris,* in an effort to revive the theology of Thomas Aquinas. But Father Hogan firmly supported the principle which was vigorously advocated by Mgr. Minot, that theology is a living science, and that to be alive in any given period or age it must be progressive. However, it can easily be seen that it is difficult to find or to construct an all-sufficient definition of progress. The result will be very largely determined by the premise from which one starts out on one's voyage of discovery.

# V

## MODERNISM AND THE IDEALISM OF EDWARD CAIRD

PAUL SABATIER says that the Modernists learned to know Protestantism through Auguste Sabatier, Dr. Edward Caird, and Professor Rudolph Eucken, and that Dr. Caird and Cardinal Newman, both of them Englishmen, were two of the most influential forerunners of Continental Modernism.* His statement that Dr. Caird influenced the Modernists from without, and Cardinal Newman from within the pale of the Catholic Church, is not in every particular true to fact. A careful study of the writings of these famous Oxford scholars readily discloses the important differences between them, despite their agreement concerning certain fundamental principles.

Dr. Edward Caird, late headmaster of Baliol College, teaches that while the consciousness of God finds expression only in the highest forms of religion, the beginnings of it can be detected under very crude and elementary forms, even in the superstitions of savages. The impulse which makes man religious and determines the character of the object worshipped may be a rational one, but is certainly in the first instance not due to conscious reason. Theology comes later. Theology is not religion. At best it is the philosophy

* Paul Sabatier, *Modernism*, p. 93. Charles Scribner's Sons.

of religion. When intuition is followed by reflection, man turns back in thought upon himself, to measure, weigh, and criticise his own religious ideas and life. Judaism in its later stages became deeply influenced by Greek philosophical ideas, and Christianity, springing out of Judaism, constantly received and was acted upon by influences of Greek origin. Already in the New Testament, especially in the writings of Saint Paul, the beginnings of a theology appear. Hence Christianity has never been a religion of mere faith. As Anselm and the Schoolmen taught, the Christian may not only pass from faith to reason, from *veneratio* to *delectatio,* but he must do so speedily. If from fear he fights reason, and rests in authority, his creed will become a dead formula and his worship a superstition. He is not called upon to become a philosopher, but he cannot long maintain his faith without turning it into living thought, as the key to the difficulties of life, and as a source of light concerning his own nature, his relation to God, and to his fellow men. If he does this, even in small measure, his religion is on the way to become a theology.

The men of the Eighteenth Century Enlightenment, in behalf of so-called Natural religion, held that philosophy and reflection are not the allies and interpreters, but the enemies of the faith in which religion begins. If this were true, religion would be an illusion of the imagination and the feelings, without any rational evidence. But Christianity in a higher sense than any other great religion claims to be the supreme power that consecrates and idealizes the life of man by relating it to that which is eternal and divine.

Therefore reflective thought, instead of disintegrating and destroying the beliefs which are the immediate expression of the religious life, evolves and elucidates them. There seems to be a deep and apparently incurable schism in the spiritual life of man between faith and reason, between his unconscious and conscious life, or, since man is always in a sense both conscious and self-conscious, a schism between his immediate experience and the reflection in which he is involved whenever he attempts to understand himself.*

Yet a faith which is not seeking intelligence is a faith which is stunted and perverted. The effort to defend Christianity by questioning the right of the intelligence to criticise it is suicidal. There are two alternatives. Religion, deprived of its former firm hold upon thought and life, is driven back upon itself, and, instead of being the great principle of unity in human life, becomes the source of the most bitter and unhappy of all its divisions. If the other alternative is adopted, and religion, in an age of science, is subjected, like everything else, to inquiry and criticism, it is threatened with the danger of losing its moral influence, and at best invites an idealistic reinterpretation of Christianity such as was attempted by Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, sacrificing, dissolving thereby, through a religion of the intellect, all personal relations between God and man which constitute the living power of Christianity.† Thus on the one side are found those who feel that the powers of man's

* Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers,* Vol. I, pp. 10, 11.

† Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Theology,* Vol. I, p. 15.

spiritual nature can be fully drawn out only by a religion which makes the strongest appeal to the volitional and emotional elements in man's nature. Therefore they cling to forms of belief which they refuse to criticise and try to exempt from criticism. On the other side are those to whom the most vital of all causes is the cause of truth and intellectual honesty, and who are therefore prepared to accept the results of free inquiry, even though thereby everything they would wish to believe should be torn away from them.

In this conflict between faith, science, and criticism, which grows out of man's own nature, some, like John Stuart Mill in his *Essays on Religion,* constantly ask themselves how much of Christianity they may retain, consistently with scientific integrity. Others, like Professor James, seek refuge in the conclusion that there is a point at which we have a right, without any other evidence, to take what we think most desirable for our spiritual life, as by that very fact sufficiently evidenced to be true. This conclusion founds belief on the will to believe. From this admission, or concession, there is only one step to the acceptance of the principles of Newman's *Grammar of Assent,* which asserts the right, in the general impossibility of finding sufficient evidence for any kind of religious truth, to treat insufficient evidence as if it were sufficient. The historian Froude says that Newman's object in that book, " from the beginning to the end, is to combat and overthrow the position of Locke, that reasonable assent is proportioned to evidence, and in its nature, therefore, admits of degrees. The argument is extremely subtle, and often difficult to follow, but

the difficulty is in the subject rather than in the treatment. Yet we never read a book, unless the *Ethics* of Spinoza be an exception, which is less convincing in proportion to its ability. You feel that you are in the hands of a thinker of the very highest powers; yet they are the powers rather of an intellectual conjuror than of a teacher who commands your confidence. You are astonished at the skill which is displayed, and unable to explain away the results; but you are conscious all the time that you are played with; you are perplexed but you are not attracted; and unless you bring a Catholic conclusion with you, you certainly will not arrive at it." *

One cannot escape the recognition here of the differentiation which must be made between Newman and Caird. In the very idea that there are two factors, or stages, of one life, there is involved the immanent reality that they are not governed by two absolutely antagonistic principles, but that there is an essential link of connection between them. Their conflict is analogous to the conflict of different members or forms of vital activity in one organism, a competition which in the healthy organism is always subordinated to coöperation, or at least only ceases to be coöperation at a lower stage, that it may become coöperation at a higher. It is thus that in organic evolution greater differentiation of function proves itself to be the means to deeper integration and more concentrated unity. And in this unity nothing that was valuable in the lower stage of life is ultimately sacrificed, however

* James A. Froude, *Short Studies on Great Subjects*—The Grammar of Assent. Charles Scribner's Sons.

much the form may be changed. We must therefore maintain, though reason may accidentally become opposed to faith, its ultimate and healthy action must preserve for us, or restore to us, all that is valuable in faith. If necessarily there is a collision between faith and reflection, at a later stage the antagonism will disappear. In the long run faith will absorb into itself the elements of the criticism which is directed against it, and grow by their means into a higher form of religious life.*

A deeper consideration of the process in question may show that the two great movements which constitute it, the movement of unconscious construction, faith, and intuition, and the movement of reflective analysis and critical reconstruction, are not essentially opposed, but rather form the necessary complement of each other in the development of man's spiritual life; and that as it is essential to faith that it should develop into reason, so the criticism of faith, as it is a criticism by reason of its own unconscious products, cannot be ultimately destructive or merely negative in its effects. James Anthony Froude, who studied under Newman in Oxford, says that religion with the latter was a personal thing between himself and his Maker, and it was not possible to feel love for and devotion toward a Being whose existence was merely probable. "As Carlyle says of himself when in a similar condition, a religion which was not a certainty was a mockery and a horror; and unshaken and unshakable as his own convictions were, Newman evidently was early at a loss for the intellectual grounds on which

* Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Theology*, Vol. I, pp. 19, 20.

the claims of Christianity to abstract belief could be based." *

Caird's conviction, on the contrary, is that though the dissolving power of criticism must be fatal to many symbols and treasures which men have thought and still think to be bound up with their religious life, it will not destroy anything really necessary to it.

Christianity, he says, had its origin in an age which was, up to a certain point, an age of reflection, and the first movement of its life was to break away from the local and national influences of the region in which it was born. It lived and moved from the beginning in an atmosphere of universality, and in spite of the reactionary influences to which, in its further history, it was exposed, and which gradually affected its life and doctrine, it never lost its essentially universal character. Hence, when its official representatives had turned it into a system of superstition and obstruction, its own influences have often inspired the reformers and revolutionists who attacked and overthrew the system. Such a universal religion, built upon the idea of the unity of man with God, and therefore on the conviction that the universe in which man lives is in its ultimate meaning and reality a spiritual world, cannot be justly regarded as a transitory phase of human development, or as a creation of feeling and imagination which science and philosophy are bound ultimately to displace. Whatever may become of the special doctrines in which it has found its first reflective ex-

* James A. Froude, *Short Studies*—The Oxford Counter-Reformation. Charles Scribner's Sons.

pression, it contains a kernel which is essentially rational, and which cannot but gain greater and greater importance the more man's spiritual life is developed. It has in it a seed of ideal truth which must grow with its growth and strengthen with its strength.*

India possesses a theological philosophy earlier than the Greek, but though subtle and profound, it is unmethodical and confused. Its influence has been secondary. It was the thought of Greece which gave to the philosophical energies of Christendom a definite method and a definite aim. It is hardly possible to trace with intelligence the evolution of doctrines either in the Early or Medieval Church, or in Modern times, without a previous study of the development of theology in the Greek philosophers.†

The Neoplatonic philosophy, founded by Plotinus, more closely related to Hindoo speculation and mysticism, aimed to solve the problem of evil by regarding matter as the utmost result of the *transeunt* activity of the One, which, though an effect of its overpowering energy, has no connection with its inner nature. It was the last refuge of Greek Dualism to think of the Absolute as subjected to a foreign necessity. If we reject the false opposition of an *immanent* and *transeunt* operation of God, and conceive of Him as essentially self-manifesting, and as capable of fully manifesting Himself only in and to spiritual beings to whom He imparts the principle of His own life, we can see our way to the solution of the difficulty which Plotinus is seeking. Plotinus was so deeply imbued

* Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Theology,* Vol. I, p. 23.
† *Idem, p.* 30.

with the conception of evil as a purely negative element, introduced into the soul by its connection with the body, that he could not adopt any view of the process of its purification and conversion to good except the escape from this defiling contact. At the same time this conflicts hopelessly with his other idea of evil as consisting in self-will and self-seeking. But we can see how the divine Being may be regarded as the principle or first cause of all his creatures, and yet not in the strict sense the cause of evil as such. The very consciousness of self carries with it the assertion of self and the seeking of self. In a finite being such self-assertion and self-seeking have in them the germ of all that is evil. Such a being has to discover by experience that it can be one with itself only as it is one with God, and it must discover this for itself.

Realizing, as Plotinus on the whole refused to do, that the seat of evil is in the consciousness and will of the rational being as such, Christianity could be content with nothing less than its complete eradication. Nor could it admit that there was anything in the world or in humanity that was essentially evil, or in which good could not be realized. It was a doctrine of conversion, redemption, regeneration, reconciliation, and it could not without inconsistency suggest or admit that there was anything outside of the circle of the divine life, least of all any human being, who, as such, must be made in the image of God. And yet it did not minimize the separation of men from God and from one another. From the beginning Christianity involved a conception of the relation between God and man. Presented at once as a doctrine em-

bodied in an individual life, Christianity seemed from the beginning to be fully concrete and real. And yet, just because it was so presented, it was really at first indefinite and unexplained, a fruitful principle rather than a developed system. It was the idea of God as revealed in man, and the idea of man as by a supreme act of self-surrender finding the perfect realization of himself as the son and servant of God. It was man losing himself, to find himself again in God, and God manifest in the flesh to draw all mankind to himself. It is this divine dialectic, as we might call it, which was directly expressed by the words of Christ as they are recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.

This also was the lesson which St. Paul generalized from the life, and, above all, from the death of Christ. It was the same solution of the difficulty of life through suffering suggested to the prophets and people of the Old Testament, trodden under feet of other nations, yet conscious of being the Israel of God. It also contained all the antagonisms developed in Greek philosophy: the antagonism of the material and the spiritual, of the phenomenal and the real or the intelligible world, of the finite and the infinite, of the temporal and the eternal. The individualistic consciousness of God which men sought and found in Christianity was new to the world. Already in the philosophical schools of the Greeks and in the synagogues of the Jews, as Wellhausen shows in his *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte* (chapter 15), there had begun to exist what may be called a church, a bond of human beings as all directly related to God, and only through God related to each other. By its

very nature this bond was altogether independent of the unity of the State. No longer, if ever, an ethical organizer of life, the Roman Empire was a maintainer merely of outward order. The brotherhood of Christ was a union of abstract charity which united men as religious beings, without making them the members of a political society. The Catholic Church was catholic because it included all Christians as individuals, in virtue of their universal or spiritual nature. But for this very reason it separated the concerns of the spiritual life from secular affairs, but it could do no more than to place an external limitation upon them.

Unable to unite the flesh and the spirit, the particular impulses of the finite life with the highest aspirations of the religious consciousness, it failed to achieve even the harmony which, on a lower plane, had been established in some of the political societies of the ancient world. It produced a collective unity of individuals through one supreme interest, but it could not mould them into a real social organism because it did not directly include their other interests. It could deal with them, in fact, only as of no account, and so created not a State, but a monastery. Thus in spite of the essential unity of the human and the divine on which it was based, the actual Church entered into the path of asceticism, and thus tended more and more to obscure that idea, or to give a transcendent interpretation to it as a unity of God with men which was realized only in the Person of Christ, and could not be in the same sense participated in by His followers. Thus the very dualism which Christ seemed

to have come to terminate began to reappear in a new form, in so far as the idea of their union was, as it were, lifted into the skies, into the region of abstract dogma as to the nature of the divinity. As this change was consummated, Christianity tended to become a religion of other-worldliness, a religion in which the life of this world was viewed merely as a preparation for another.

This conception was at first resisted by the conception of Christ as the Jewish Messiah. But Greek, and especially Neoplatonic influences, had already done much to modify the Jewish religion, as shown by the writings of Philo, and was of necessity to affect the Christian Church still more profoundly. As soon as the Messianic idea left Jewish soil, it had to find an equivalent or substitute among the conceptions of the classical nations, and no idea could seem so appropriate as the *Logos,* which had already been adopted by Philo. The Messianic idea of the Jewish mind was thereby profoundly modified, and its limitations were thrown off. Thus St. Paul presents Christ as "the first-born of many brethren," and later on declares Him to be the "image of the invisible God," * the Being who "is before all things," and by whom "all things consist." There was danger that the Neoplatonic idea of the *Logos* should be carried so far as to reduce the whole human life of Christ to a mere illusive appearance of one who was not a real human being at all. Even the Gospel of St. John might seem

* Colossians 1 : 16, 17. Dr. Caird was inclined to ascribe the First Epistle and the Gospel of St. John to the same author, or writer.

to give countenance to such a view.* Just because the Son of Man became so much lost in the Son of God, the absolute necessity arose to assert anew his real humanity. As a result of all these counter-tendencies, the Church had to reach some definite doctrinal conclusion and conscious conviction concerning the Person of Christ, which was accomplished after great conflict, in the early ecumenical councils. The ultimate result of the conflict was the assertion of the unity of the divinity and humanity of Christ. But unfortunately this conclusion was confined to Christ alone, and in the second place, the unity was regarded as static rather than dynamic; that is, not as a unity realized in the process of the Christian life, the process of self-surrender and self-sacrifice through which humanity becomes—what potentially it is—the highest organ of the divine self-manifestation, but as a unity that exists independently of any process whatever.

This imperfect result was necessary that the principle of the unity of the divine and the human might be asserted before it could be worked out to any further consequence. Christ was the one crucial instance of this union, which, if it could be maintained as real, must inevitably determine the whole issue. If one man living such a life of self-sacrifice for mankind were in perfect unity with God, so that his consciousness of himself could be taken as the divine self-consciousness, then must not the same be true of all who followed in His footsteps? If so, then the highest goodness was shown to be only the realization of an

* Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Theology,* Vol. II, p. 358 (Lecture 27).

ideal which every human soul, as such, bears within it. God is manifested in man, under the ordinary conditions of human life, whenever man gives himself up to God. The power that builds and holds the universe together is shown in a higher form than by any creative act in every man who lives not for himself, but as an organ and minister of divine love to men.

At first and for a long time this manifestation and realization were centred in Christ, who had to be "lifted up" ere he could draw all men to him. In other men this unity was a "far-off divine event" which had to be realized by self-conquest that never could be quite complete. Christianity had cast man down in order to raise him up. The dualism which here reappeared was supplied by the reflective thought of the Greek philosophy, and deepened by Neoplatonism in the very effort to overcome it. The latter tended to break the unity of life and thought which Christianity sought to establish, or at least to limit and make imperfect the reconciliation which Christianity sought to attain.

The negative side which Christianity had in it from the first is shown in its essential moral idea of self-realization through self-sacrifice. Christ taught that a new and richer life would rise out of the death or sacrifice of the immediate natural existence, but He demanded that the old life should perish ere the new life could arise. These two elements, the negative and the positive, are held in perfect balance in the consciousness of Christ, as shown by the Synoptic Gospels. Under the influence of Neoplatonic modes of thought, the gulf between Christ and other men tended

to widen. The heresy which reduced the humanity of Christ to an illusive appearance was defeated in its direct aim, but it was victorious in so far as the action against it absolutely separated the glorified Christ from, and raised Him above, all His fellows, till it became almost a paradox to say that "he was in all points tempted like as we are."

The early enunciation and defence of the doctrine of the Trinity was immediately connected with the doctrine of the Incarnation, and essentially an attempt to deal with the question of the unity of God and man. But the later efforts in that direction, in the time of St. Augustine, dealt with the inner nature of the Deity in an almost unintelligible manner. The Son of God was thus elevated so far above the Son of Man as to lead to the creation of new and unwarranted offices of mediation, which were assigned to the Virgin and the Saints, in order to fill the breach thus made in the unity of the human and the divine. This led to a further modification of the Christian view of life. The possibility of a realization of the life of Christ in other men could not be denied, but was referred to another world. Any enemy is a friend in disguise who again and again has forced the Church and the world to recognize how imperfectly the spiritual object of Christianity has been attained, how far the actual is from the ideal, how secular and profane the life of even the most Christian of men still is, how far the kingdoms of this world are from realizing the idea of the kingdom of God. The idea of the unity of God and man may itself become the most shallow of allusions, if that unity be taken as a static identity, and, if

it be not recognized that the realization of it involves the conquest of the deepest of all antagonisms.

It is essential to Christianity to maintain, in the face of all the positive tendencies of the modern spirit, that a true self-development can be attained only through self-sacrifice, and that, if God reveals Himself in man, it is only as man gives himself up to be the servant and organ of a divine purpose in humanity. Dr. Caird quotes with the highest commendation one of the sayings of Jesus on the cross. He says that the prayer, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do," with its reduction of evil to ignorance, is perhaps the most victorious assertion of the relativity of evil that ever has been made.* Since these words simply deplore the mistaken view lodged in the minds of the Jewish mob, of the singular conscious innocence of their gentle victim, they cannot be interpreted as a final, authoritative definition of sin.† Socrates many years before had also taught that evil in man is the result of ignorance, and that to escape it he must learn to know himself. Moral evil, or sin, the estrangement of the soul from righteousness and divine fellowship, is an offence against God's majesty, holiness, and love. Therefore it can find forgiveness, regeneration, conversion, redemption, and eternal life in no other way than by atonement. That self-sacrifice through which alone true self-development and the unity between the divine and the human can be attained would otherwise be without significance. Moreover, owing to his defective, or latitudinarian view of sin, Dr. Caird ex-

* Edward Caird, *The Evolution of Theology*, Vol. II, p. 365.
† St. Luke 23: 34.

plains the death and decay of the visible organism in keeping with it. The Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, he says, proves that, taken by itself, in its own sources, it had nothing in common with the Neoplatonic doctrine of the intrinsic evil nature of matter. Hence, according to these deductions, the divine Sonship of Jesus does not rest upon the tradition of the Virgin Birth, but centres in, and must be attested by, His self-conscious relation to God, and His sinless, guileless life, as the germ, the dynamic beginning, of the union of God and man, of the process of the "divine dialectic," from generation to generation, from age to age. The conclusion, therefore, is self-evident that men of the school of Caird, the Modernists who have been acted upon by him, cannot seek the union of the divine and human objectively in the so-called daily miracle of the Mass, in the consecrated, consubstantiated wine and wafer. They find it in the conscience, consciousness, and charismal gift of the true followers of Christ, and in the uplifting, prophetic, and spiritual atmosphere of their brotherhood fellowship. The wafer is not the Christ. The wonder of Grace is not seated in the wine. The Communion has its stronghold and inner manifestation in the man, and in the assemblage, the ecclesia, when really filled with the Unseen Presence.

## VI

## THE VIRGIN BIRTH AND THE INTERPRETERS OF MODERNISM

THE Virgin Birth, so intimately related, as we have seen, in the teaching and faith of the Medieval Church with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, the Modernists explain away, or pass in silence by. M. Duchesne, a famous French historian, who, on account of his liberal views, was excommunicated by the Pope, illustrates this attitude of mind. This is his interpretation: "But the thoughts of the faithful were always brought back, from the origin of all things or from their final end, to their religious state in the actual present. They were Christians through Jesus Christ, because a Man called Jesus, whom most of them had never seen, had called them to Himself. This Man had died. He had risen again. He was seated now at the right hand of God. He would soon reappear in glory, and fight a decisive battle against evil. Who was He? Whence originated this conception of religious Leader, of powerful representative of God, of Judge of all mankind? As the Jewish Messiah, He had a history behind Him; He had been predestinated by God, foretold and described by the prophets. One of His highest titles was that of Son of God. But on this most essential point there was no question of keeping within the Jewish tradi-

tion; the declarations of St. Paul, St. John, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews manifestly surpassed it. And their declarations only expanded the common belief, which, though at that time still wanting in power of expression, was deep and unyielding. Jesus, although He belonged, through the reality of His manhood, to the realm of visible creation, belonged also, in the very depth of His being, to the Godhead. How that could be was to be made clear by degrees. But the essence of this belief was in the souls of Christians from the beginning. The New Testament reveals it in its earliest as in its latest books. Following the New Testament, the early Christian books, whether orthodox or Gnostic, all take this fundamental belief for granted, as universally accepted and firmly rooted in tradition. And here considerable stress must be laid on the Jewish education, through which Christian thought had passed. Among pagans there were many ways of being divine; the old gods of Olympus were gods by birth, their genealogies were well known; others, however, were merely deified heroes. The Macedonian and Moorish kings, like many others, had been worshipped; so were the Roman Emperors still. One god more or less was of no consequence to the polytheistic conscience.

"It was quite otherwise with a conscience formed by the religious ideas of Israel. 'Hear, O Israel! thy God, the God of Israel, is One.' This credo is that of the modern, as of the ancient Jew, and expresses what is both most profound and most obvious in their religion. To admit that Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are God, is to admit that they participate in the

very essence of the One God, that they are, each of them, identical with Him, yet without being deprived of certain special characteristics. This is the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. It is almost the same now as it was in the Early Church. Theologians knew, or at any rate said, far more about it. Our subject, however, is religion and not the schools." *

Batiffol, on the other hand, does not even mention the tradition of the Virgin Birth in his justly celebrated work, *Primitive Catholicism,* which professes to be a complete answer to Professor Harnack. He cites the testimony of the Roman historian, Tacitus, concerning the trial of Jesus. " Christus, after whom the Christians are called, was condemned to death, under Tiberius, by the procurator Pontius Pilate. Repressed, then, this execrable superstition was again overflowing, about the year 64, under Nero, not only in Judea where it had arisen, but in Rome itself, where all forms of wickedness and infamy flow in and find adepts." Batiffol interprets the passage as follows: " We cannot take in its strict meaning this statement of Tacitus, who, because of his great artistic taste, is always to be suspected of artificial composition and presentation. In this particular instance he describes the facts as though, from the death of Jesus to the burning of Rome, in 64, Christianity had passed through a protracted period in which it was apparently crushed, and then, a short while before the year 64, had suddenly begun to expand, not only in Judea, but even in Rome. That Christianity suddenly expanded

* M. Louis Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* Vol. I, pp. 31, 32.

is not correct; what is correct is that, toward the year 64, Christianity appeared as distinct from Judaism." * Thus also according to Batiffol we have here the progression from the hidden and inchoate to the articulate and visible. As one born out of due time, St. Paul does not "condescend to flesh and blood," nor does he go "to Jerusalem to the other Apostles who were before" him, but receives his apostleship directly from God through the risen and ascended Christ.†

Batiffol, Tyrrell, and Loisy represent three different phases of Modernism. It is difficult to summarize in a short paragraph or two the viewpoint of the great critical scholar and teacher, Batiffol, of the University of Toulouse, in France. He is a conservative Modernist and a traditionist. He aims as far as possible to find well-developed rudiments of the Roman Catholic Church of the Middle Age and the present day in the Apostolic and Primitive Christian Age. To accomplish this he occasionally falls into critical opportunism. He is wedded to the search for Catholic unity and the principle of authority, and pursues his purpose with admirable historic vision and scholarly acumen. His late work, *Primitive Catholicism,* is a profound and edifying exposition of the subject from that standpoint. But he is in many respects a prose poet, and draws upon his personal predilections and pious imagination for his adjustment and readaptation of the early sources at command. Thus we see, the method,

* Pierre Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 17. Tacit. "Annal." xv. 44.

† *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 45. Longmans, Green & Co.

proving too much, defeats itself and refutes its own conclusions.*

He says: "The divine originality of Christianity consists in the fact that it inaugurated in the world—not a charismatic or prophetic movement, still less a movement of eschatological suspense and anxiety—not a brotherhood, with reciprocity of aid and affection, superior to any exclusivism due to diversity of race—but in Tertullian's appropriate words, a religious revelation, a rule of conduct, a covenant of hopes: all this held and lived in common by the 'faithful,' the 'brethren,' the 'elect' of each church and of all the churches. At its rise this *corpus* had no legal existence; when the law began to notice it, it was to proscribe it as a crime. Yet it did not then dissolve: it resisted and kept united, in spite of all efforts to the contrary. *This* is the Catholic phenomenon, the true principle of which we have to discover." † Batiffol teaches that the principle of authority is vested in the *Twelve,* who received it directly from Jesus. They, the companions of His public ministry, were the witnesses of His resurrection. In the first years of Christianity, when everything was oral, the Apostles of Christ are, as it were, the authentic word, the word that justifies. At the same time Batiffol names "justification by faith," Paul's principle of the Gospel, applicable to both Jews and Gentiles. This doctrine, as we have seen, is called by interpreters of the Reformation the *material principle* of Protestantism. But in

* Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 17. Longmans, Green & Co.

† *Idem,* p. 36.

the relation of faith to the believer he at once falls back upon authority. "Paul teaches what he has learned; and what he tells them his converts must preserve just as they have been taught. The idea of the deposit of faith is active here." * This is traced back by him to Christ, and emphasized as the principle of unity. "Peter's practical hesitation at Antioch raises the question of the unity of the Church; Paul's decision solves the question in the sense of a unity based not on condescension or political sagacity, but directly and solely on faith in Christ and His supernatural life in us." †

Harnack gives the following estimate of the work of Batiffol: "In this exposition there are few inaccuracies, in the worst sense of the term, except in what he says of Jesus. But, in tracing the line of historical development, he has, at every stage, overlooked the slight deviations which, taken together, cause most momentous changes of direction. We have thus, instead of a curve, a straight line which, with such a method, it would be easy to prolong even to the Catholicism of the 'Syllabus' and of the Encyclical letter of 1907." Historically, therefore, while early Christianity possesses many elements not found in Protestantism, those elements of piety and worship have been so radically altered that Catholicism, Roman Catholicism, "can justly claim to be an ancient state with an ancient ideology, and yet in its essence it has little in common with infant Christianity." Thus, while recommending Batiffol's able work, *Primitive Catholi-*

* Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, p. 65.
† *Ibid.*, p. 64.

*cism,* to students of Church History, Harnack does not endorse its conclusions, because they are artificial and forced, in some crucial particulars, and out of harmony with the line of true development.

Professor Lobstein of Strassbourg styles "Father" Tyrrell "the most profound and penetrating interpreter of Modernism." Tyrrell was born, trained, and educated in the Anglican Church, and left it to enter the Roman Communion. Believing that Protestantism is in principle individualistic, he regarded it for this reason as being also self-destructive. "Profoundly as I venerate the great truths and principles for which Protestantism stands, I am somewhat chilled by its inhumanity, its naked severity, its relentless rationality." * For this reason he sought refuge in the bosom of the older Church. He was attracted by a great and thoroughly organized and officered visible and tangible church or fellowship. But he wished that church to be filled with Spirit and Life. He was a mystic. "The one thing needful beyond doubt," he wrote, "is communion with the invisible Church, that is, with God as presented to us in Christ and in all Christlike men, past, present, and future; with all those who, whatever their professed creed, in any way or degree suffer, and forsake themselves for God's cause and God's will." † "Modernism does not believe," he proclaimed, "in the religious independence of every isolated individual; nor does it believe in the absolute subjection of all to the private will and judgment of a privileged individual who can impose theological

* *Medievalism,* p. 186.

† *A Much Abused Letter,* pp. 62, 63.

definitions upon the rest under pain of eternal damnation." *

Tyrrell follows Moehler and Newman in his idea of the perpetuation of the historical Christ in the historical Church, but so broadens it as to threaten it with a radical alteration of its form of expression in the history of the world. "Christ Himself, reincarnate from generation to generation in the historical Church, which is His body, continuing through the ages a perpetual ministry of mediation and revelation," is also his doctrinal position.† But with other Modernists Tyrrell recognizes the scantiness and comparative indefiniteness or insufficiency of the documentary evidence bearing upon the beginnings of Christianity. The crucial question these men ask is, "whether faith can remain fettered to the personality of the terrestrial Jesus," figured and presented in the fragmentary Synoptic accounts, and "whether the problem is to be transformed into an article of faith." Is history to be a kind of pocket in which the soul and mankind must dwell and die out, "cribbed, cabined, and confined"? Tyrrell calls this "a bold contention, that all ecclesiastical development is simply a mechanical unpacking of what was given in a tight parcel 2,000 years ago." ‡ He accepts the word Modernism as descriptive of "the opposite contention—of a belief in time, in growth, in vital and creative evolution." Hence he declares himself to be a Christian mystic, and says: "St. Paul is a true interpreter when he

* *Medievalism*, pp. 29, 30.

† *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 73.

‡ "Modernism and Protestantism," *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1912, p. 72.

identifies Christ with the Spirit; when he speaks of the indwelling of the Spirit as the indwelling of Christ." "It is the Spirit made man. The Word which enlightens every man is made flesh; what works within us stands before us, to be seen and heard and handled. In Him we have seen the Father—not in his fulness, but so far as God is inclusively the ideal image of man; so far as God reveals man to himself, so to say, and lives our life Himself." * "To fill us with this Spirit was the mission of Jesus; but not to teach us metaphysics or science or history or ethics or economics." † Therefore he further defines Modernism as taking a middle course, so to speak, against the individualism of private judgment and the privileged judgment of a single individual elevated to absolute vicegerency, "who can impose theological definitions upon the rest under pain of eternal damnation." ‡

The Church throughout is only an aid to faith, a witness of the indwelling Christ, identical with the Spirit, moving onward, growing from age to age into a more perfect manifestation and realization of the life of God through Christ in man. "This idea of Jesus," he writes, "as the Divine indwelling and saving Spirit seems to me the very essence of Christianity. Faith in Christ has never meant merely faith in a teacher and His doctrine, but an apprehension of His personality as revealing itself within us. Through the

* Newman Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, p. 75.

† Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, pp. 262, 265. *Ibid.*, pp. 269-271.

‡ *Medievalism*, p. 116.

mystical body, animated by the Spirit, we are brought into immediate contact with the ever-present Christ. We hear Him in His Gospel, we touch and handle Him in the sacraments. He lives on in the Church, not metaphorically, but actually. He finds a growing medium of the self-utterance ever complementing and correcting that of his mortal individuality." *

It is plain to be seen that this view of Tyrrell does not differ very materially from the New Testament teaching of the Priesthood of Believers and the Evangelical doctrine of the Christian community as the mystical embodiment of Christ and His indwelling Spirit. Tyrrell thus shifted the seat of authority, called into question the papal claim of infallibility, warred against some phases of traditional credulity, magic, and miracle-mongering, and naturally invited the excommunication which was visited upon him. The Modernism of Tyrrell refuses to do unquestioning obeisance to ultramontane dictatorial absolutism, or Protestant religious self-opinionatedness and self-sufficiency. "It maintains the necessity of religious authority, but defines this authority in a spiritual, inward, moral sense." † "All the Church can say to me is: 'If you love me, keep my commandments.' If I do not keep her commandments she can say, 'You do not love me'; but she cannot coerce or threaten me. She can tell me I am in danger of hell, but she cannot send me there. Her duty is to try to make me love her once more." ‡

* *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, pp. 271, 275.
† *Medievalism*, pp. 26, 40.
‡ *Medievalism*, p. 63.

## VII

## THE CHURCH AND HER EVER-PRESENT LORD

THIS doctrine, though modified to suit the framework of the ancient Church, is not strange to Protestants, nor is it essentially a new thing in the history of Christianity. In the Dispersion the simple service of the synagogue became the precursor of the evangelical form of worship. The Roman Catholic Church perpetuates the Jewish temple service, with its ornate surroundings and sacrificial ceremonies, afterward modified by a precipitate or injection of pagan influence dating from the conflict of Christianity with Greco-Roman polytheism, and shown chiefly in the worship of saints and the introduction of images, which came about by the substitution of names sacred to the beginnings of Christianity for the heathen deities and the nature-worship they memorialized. The old Catholic doctrine concerning the Mass is that in it Christ is daily sacrificed for sin; that it is a repetition of the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. This doctrine the Reformers rejected and condemned because they discovered that it is without foundation in Holy Scripture.

Moehler gives the Mass the modified, dependent, or relative interpretation. He says: "The Church, considered in one point of view, is the living figure of

Christ, manifesting Himself and working through all ages, whose atoning and redeeming acts it, in consequence, eternally repeats, and uninterruptedly continues. The Redeemer not merely lived eighteen hundred years ago, so that He hath since disappeared, and we retain but an historical remembrance of Him, as of a deceased man; but He is, on the contrary, eternally living in His Church, and in the sacrament of the altar He hath manifested this in a sensible manner to creatures endowed with sense. If Christ, concealed under an earthly veil, unfolds to the end of time His whole course of actions begun on earth, He, of necessity, eternally offers Himself to the Father as a victim for men; and the real permanent exposition hereof can never fail in the Church, if the historical Christ is to celebrate in her His entire imperishable existence." * Cardinal Newman shares this same view, and describes the priestly function of the ministrant as being the greatest act performed on earth, because in it there occurs the "invocation of God." All this represents a usurpation by human power of the divine effulgence for which there is not a word of verification in Holy Scripture.

Luther also sought to perpetuate the historic Christ mystically in the Eucharist as the climax of the whole Christian worship. He found his bulwark against the ancient error of Transubstantiation in his doctrine of *Ubiquity*. The Greek Catholic Church preserved the type which became fixed in the fifth century, and crystallized with and in it. Her Eucharistic canon stands much nearer the ancient or Primitive Church

* Moehler, *Symbolism*, p. 312.

than the Roman Catholic, because of the retention of the prayer of invocation, in the vernacular, addressed to the Holy Spirit, before the words of institution, thus making every misunderstanding impossible, as if the consecration did not consist in the prayer, but in the historical repetition.*

The Reformed Church finds the historic Christ perpetuated mystically in the Church by the witness of the Holy Spirit, aided by, but not in any especial sense or degree identified objectively with, the framework or form of the visible Church and her sacraments. Christ lives on in the Church in and by the witness and power of the Holy Spirit, who is not to be confused or identified with the Christ, as Tyrrell has it. "If I go not away the Comforter will not come; but if I go away I will send Him unto you and He will lead you into all Truth."

J. Tixeront, a Modernist writer who lives in Lyons, France, is the author of a work entitled *History of Dogmas,* which has been translated into English from the fifth edition, and published in two volumes by B. Herder, St. Louis, Missouri, and Freiburg, Germany. In his preface the author states that it was his first intention to complete the work in one volume, but that the importance of the subject and the abundance of the material compelled him to write a second volume. The two volumes trace the history of dogmas from the beginning of Christianity to the year 430 A.D., as the point of demarkation between the subject-matter of the second and third volumes. The first volume covers the period preceding the outbreak of the Arian

* Chevalier Bunsen, *Hippolytus,* Vol. II, p. 191.

heresy. The second volume treats of the great heresies of the patristic period, an attempted appreciation of the Augustinian theology in conformity with the Tridentine decrees, and a review of the Pelagian controversy. The work as a whole is an elaborate and learned though laboured presentation of the subject in a dry, scholastic manner, and theoretically supports the characteristic tenets of Roman Catholicism. The author marshals all the dogmatic statements in the writings of the ancient Church Fathers, which he finds to be in agreement with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, and which by skilful manipulation can be turned into apparent likeness with the same.

This latter misleading demonstration he applies to the career of Thascius Cecilius Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, whom he admits to have been an ecclesiastical administrator rather than a theologian, and whom he tries to commit to the tradition of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. Tixeront says that "Pope" Stephen laid claim to that primacy, as the successor of St. Peter, in the senate of bishops who reign over the vast social organism of the Church, one in faith and one in obedience. "But setting aside these various readings or interpolations, it is manifest that St. Cyprian does not regard the See of Rome as an ordinary See. It is Peter's See, and the Bishops of Rome are Peter's successors." * Tixeront cites *Epistle* LV in support of his conclusions, but that letter was addressed to the people of Thibaris to exhort them to martyrdom, and does not contain any allusion whatsoever to the vicegerency of the Bishop of Rome. On

* Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, Vol. I, p. 359.

the contrary, at the Seventh Council of Carthage, in September, 258 A.D., where the voice of eighty-seven bishops, assembled at the call of Cyprian, was heard concerning the baptism of heretics and schismatics, and where the assumptions of "Pope" Stephen, who had denounced the decrees of the African Council on the same subject, were condemned, Cyprian said: "It remains that upon this same matter each of us should bring forward what we think, judging no man, nor rejecting any one from the right of communion, if he should think differently from us. For neither does any one of us set himself up as a bishop of bishops, nor by tyrannical terror does any compel his colleague to the necessity of obedience, since every bishop, according to the allowance of his liberty and power, has his own proper right of judgment, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another. But let us all wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only one that has the power both of preferring us in the government and of judging us in our conduct there." *

Even if we suppose that Cyprian recognized a decided trend toward the concentration of preferment and power in the direction of the Roman See, this language does not indicate that Cyprian himself believed in such an "evolution" as predetermined by the intent of Jesus.† In passing over to Christianity, and submitting to baptism, it was believed at this time

* The Ante-Nicene Christian Library: *The Writings of Cyprian,* Vol. I, p. 180. T. & T. Clarke.

† The Ante-Nicene Library: *The Writings of Cyprian,* Vol. II, p. 200

that one could, apart from inner quality, be made the recipient of the divine pardon of sin through this baptism alone, which was identified with regeneration. So magical a power was finally ascribed to baptism that the sacred rite itself served as the wonder-working agent of the spiritual transformation. Tertullian, who shared this view of baptism, but did not probe deep enough to point out the real cause of the secularization of the Church, already before the time of Cyprian, deplored and battled against the unhappy consequences which followed the immoral and irreligious conclusions that were drawn by the catechumens from this doctrine of baptismal regeneration, *opus operatum.** The tendency accompanied the extreme Montanistic external discipline in vogue, and therefore neither the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, nor Cyprian's view of the Church in the purely administrative sense, can be classified as shining examples of the "evolution" of dogmas. And, moreover, this holds true with far greater force in relation to the ambitious designs of "Pope" Stephen to become a bishop of bishops.

Tixeront applies the same rule to the Augustinian interpretation of the Lord's Supper, which he whittles and beats into apparent harmony with the Roman Catholic doctrine of the "Real Presence" in the Eucharist, following his admission that essentially the Augustinian doctrine of the Lord's Supper accords with the explanation given many centuries later by John Calvin, the Genevan Reformer, in his doctrine of the spiritual Presence of Christ in the sacred trans-

* Böhringer, *Die Kirche Christi,* Vol. IV, pp. 825, 826.

action as a whole, and not in the visible elements themselves. The author misrepresents the Augustinian position entirely, and in relation thereto actually begs the question as far as the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is concerned.* St. Augustine did not hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation at all, and his doctrine concerning the Holy Supper is essentially the view taught in the Reformed Confessions of Faith. Bread and wine are to him signs of the body and blood of Christ. "Our Lord manifested a wonderful patience on the day when He asked Judas to come to the meal at which He commended and gave the sign (figure) of His body to His disciples." †

Tixeront in the preface to the first volume does not bind the reader to an acceptance of his conclusions based upon the citations he gives in support of them, as drawn from the patristic writings. He says that the reading of a number of great works like Chevalier's *Repertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Age,* and other books of the same class, have been of much help to him, but that they were only preliminary to the careful study of the texts themselves. Whatever judgment the reader may place upon the analyses and appreciations, whether they seem to him exact or erroneous, he may be sure that they rest upon personal and direct examination of original documentary evidence. He does not wish his *History of Dogmas* to be considered complete and self-sufficing, but to be regarded as an instrument for further work, and as

* Tixeront, *History of Dogmas,* Vol. II, pp. 410, 411.

† Böhringer, *Die Kirche Christi, Aurelius Augustinus,* Vol. XI, Part II, p. 3

a guide in the study of the doctrinal monuments which have come down to us from Christian antiquity.

The Modernistic admissions of the author in the "Introduction" to the first volume, in the light of the current of thought in our time, are the most important feature of his work. Here he recognizes the principle of "evolution" as a fundamental factor in the new world view. He explains a dogma to be a truth revealed and defined by the Church, a truth which the faith of the Christian is obliged to accept. The collection of all the truths thus revealed and defined is called *dogma* or *dogmas*. Christian Doctrine and Christian Dogma are not the same. The former covers a somewhat more extensive field, including both the defined dogmas as well as the teachings ordinarily and currently propounded with the full approval of the *magisterium*. Dogmas are to be only the translation into technical formulas, the expression in clear and precise language, of the data of Revelation, of the teachings of Holy Scripture, and of early Christian tradition. The author acknowledges that there is no similarity in words between the teachings of Jesus and Paul on the one side, and those of the Council of Nicæa or Trent on the other, but he asserts that there is equivalence and substantial identity. The latter simply reproduce the former. Such is the affirmation of the Catholic Church. Still the question arises, he says, how the transition was made from the Gospel, St. Paul, or St. Clement, to the statements of Nicæa or to the profession of faith of Pius IV? What was the course followed by Christian thought in that evolution which thus brought it from

the primitive elements of its doctrine to the development of its theology? What were its stages in that progress? What impulses, what suspensions, what hesitations did it undergo? What circumstances threatened to bring about its deviation from that path, and, as a matter of fact, what deviations did occur in certain parts of the Christian community? By what men, and how, was this process accomplished, and what were the ruling ideas, the dominant principles, which determined its course? These questions the history of dogmas must answer. Its object is, therefore, to set before our eyes the intimate working of Christian thought on the primitive data of Revelation, a working by means of which it grasps them more and more fully, illustrates them and makes them fruitful, develops them, and finally marshals them into a harmonious and scholarly system, without altering their doctrinal substance, as Catholics hold, or modifying their doctrinal groundwork. Thus the History of Dogmas is a part of Ecclesiastical History. But because of a difference in extension, the history of dogmas is not exactly a history of Christian Doctrine. However, as a matter of fact, and in practice, they must be almost blended together, since a history of Christian Doctrine necessarily includes the history of dogmas, and since this last branch of theological science, in its turn, cannot present a full historical sketch of the teachings which have not yet become the object of solemn decisions.

The author also carefully distinguishes between the History of Theology and the History of Dogmas, on the one hand, and Positive Theology, Patrology, and

Patristics, and the History of Dogmas, on the other. A similar distinction may be drawn between Historical Theology and the History of Dogmas. In Historical Theology history is not the end, but only the means. The end is a theological one, namely, to show from the history of ideas and facts that the faith actually current in the Church is normally connected with the apostolic faith, and that the Christians of to-day are truly the direct and lawful heirs of the first disciples of Jesus. One can plainly see that the premise here laid down grants the greatest latitude and an altogether unwarranted prerogative to the system builders who occupy the seats of the mighty, and to whom, by the fortune or the fate of history, the opportunity is thus given to frame new dogmas and add them to the body of the old, forgetful of the fact that the first great function of the Church is not to manufacture fresh articles of belief to be bound upon the conscience of mankind, but to bear witness to Christ, to labour for the union and communion of repentant and believing souls with Jesus, and to glorify Him in the hearts and lives of men as the Risen and Triumphant Son of God and Son of Man.

Tixeront says that the distinctions among the theological sciences show what the History of Dogmas really is, but that it is more difficult to determine how far one must go back in tracing the line of dogmatic evolution, and how far that line includes or excludes the history of Revelation itself. We have seen, he says, that dogmas claim to have been revealed, and to be simply Revelation reduced to formulas. If such a claim is justified, their primary origin is the

act or series of revealing acts, and their early shape, their substance, the teachings of the Old Testament, and of Jesus and His Apostles; in other words, the Theology of the Old and New Testaments. Hence a complete history of dogmas will include a history of revelation, and a sketch of that theology. Any one who desires to examine the legitimacy of such a claim is brought back to the study of the early origin of dogmas, and of the influence which was exerted upon their formation by philosophy, surrounding religions, the authentic or apocryphal writings of the Old Testament, Jewish tradition, popular imagination, and of course by the historical fact of the preaching of Jesus and the prophets, and so on. This field is rather extensive, and properly belongs to a certain number of special sciences, exegetical and apologetical. On this ground the author deems it best to avoid this field, and not to inquire into the early sources of the content of the dogmas whose history he has written. He makes no distinction between the doctrine of the Trinity, which plainly lies embedded as a self-revelation of God, in the Old and New Testaments, and the dogmas of the Infallibility of the Pope and the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which were adopted and declared by the Vatican Council and Pius IX. He accepts the theory of evolution unqualifiedly and without definition.

## VIII

# THE HISTORIC CHRIST AND THE BYPATHS OF GERMAN PHILOSOPHY

OLD orthodoxy and Hegelian philosophy are certainly two different things, says Karl Noll, but they confront each other in their judgment of the essence of Christianity. Writers like Bruno Baur, Holsten, Drews, Wrede, and others, see in Christianity a religious, philosophical, mythological, or an astral system, which has been built up by a scholastic process, and therefore is understood by the pure rule of reason as an objective doctrine that stands firmly fixed, and in relation to which denial or acceptance can be professed only by a *sacrificium intellectus.* Therefore any one who thinks logically is able to render an intelligently practical judgment concerning Christianity without entering into an inner heart attitude toward it, or even when antagonizing it as an enemy.* Tixeront contents himself with a mere sketch of the teachings of Jesus as related in the New Testament. For information concerning Christian origins one must, he says, consult the results of criticism in the field of primitive data. Merely and only the *terminus a quo* of the *processus* is the basic thought and motive underlying his treatment of the history of

* Rev. Karl Noll, *Der Kampf um die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu,* p. 53.

dogmas. In a marginal note he advises the reader who desires to extend his investigations in that direction by the study of works in which such problems are specifically dealt with to consult not only Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine,* J. B. Mozley's *Theory of Development: A Criticism of Dr. Newman's Essay* (1879), De La Barre's *La Vie du Dogme Catholic* (Paris, 1898), but also Alfred Loisy's *L'Evangile et l'Eglise* (1903), and *Autour d'un petit Livre,* notwithstanding the fact that the last two books are condemned. In true modernistic style he adds that those things alone have a history which live and change. That there have been such vicissitudes cannot be doubted. The important point is to determine their character and results, to point out their limits, causes, and laws; in short, to define how far the substance of dogmas is affected by that evolution. One may treat the question by the theoretical method, *à priori,* which begins with the fixed dogmas as taught by the Church, or one may follow the historical method, *à posteriori,* which gathers up the results revealed by a careful study of the facts. He makes a passing allusion to the difference between the conclusions of the Protestant theologian Harnack, and Dr. Newman while still an Anglican, from the principle of development. The comparison with the oak, which grows from the acorn, shows us how greatly two doctrines may differ apparently, one of which, however, proceeds from the other.

Tixeront's *History of Dogmas,* in English translation, bears the *Nihil Obstat* of F. G. Holweck, Censor Librorum, the Imprimatur of J. A. Connolly, V. G.

Innocent III

(Vol. I, Oct. 18, 1910, St. Louis, Mo.), and that of Dr. John G. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis (Nov. 19, 1913, Vol. II). Here we have before us a strange combination of circumstances. Alfred Loisy denies the miraculous birth of Jesus and His physical resurrection from the dead. Moreover, he has been excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church by the Pope for promulgating teachings which are at variance with the fundamental faith of historic Christianity. These results Tixeront tacitly accepts, and then plants upon them the superstructure of the dogmatic and ecclesiastical system of the Papacy, as it has come down to us mainly from the age of Gregory VII and Innocent III. Loisy riddles the historic foundations of Christianity. Tixeront embraces his conclusions, and upon the shadowy background of the Jesus-portrait and the primitive Christian community, reduced to myth and fable, and in defiance of the papal proscription of Loisy's books, he erects the framework of Medieval Catholicism, and all its post-apostolic dogmas, whether in agreement with the New Testament or not. And then to crown the daring achievement, the Right Rev. John G. Glennon, D.D., Archbishop of the Diocese of St. Louis, places his imprimatur upon the work.* If Loisy is correct in his conclusions, on the one hand, and the Pope did well, on the other, to excommunicate him, then a book like Tixeront's *History of Dogmas* may be useful to the antiquarian as a museum of ancient theological curiosities, controversies, conflicts, heresies, errors,

* Tixeront, *History of Dogmas*, Vol. I, pp. 5, 6, 7. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.

priest-made fictions, and philosophical hybrids, but can never be taken seriously as in every detail an authentic, trustworthy, and binding presentation of fundamental Christian history, faith, government, and life. It is indeed an anomaly that in the wake of the papal condemnation of "Modernism," with its heretical implications and its virtual assailment of the essentials of historic Christianity, a prominent American archbishop should place his imprimatur upon a production whose author subscribes to the radical "Modernism" of the excommunicated priest and professor, Alfred Loisy.*

If it can be shown that the Jesus-portrait in the New Testament is a truly historic account of divinely appointed events which have in view the redemption of our race, in fulfilment, and not in perpetuation of the Old Testament types, shadows, sacrifices, priesthood, and prophecies, then any hierarchical system which arrogates to itself an absolute spiritual overlordship among the professed followers of Christ cannot maintain its contention and claim in the light of ultimate fundamental evangelical revelation. Here, then, is the dilemma. In either case, whether from the standpoint of the theory of evolution, or of the Historic Christ, dogmas not in harmony with the original teachings of Jesus, as fundamental conceptions of saving truth, and as inspired records of basic elemental New Testament revelation, cannot bind the conscience and command the obedience of the enlightened Christian, Catholic or Protestant, except merely in response to the caprice of preference, at the sacrifice

* Pope Pius X, Encyclical Letter, "Pascendi Gregis.

of mental and spiritual honesty, and the price of ethical freedom. "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." * Tixeront's work is a masterly effort to bring the dogmatic system of the Roman Catholic Church, in *statu quo,* as set forth in the decrees of the Council of Trent, and the Vatican Council of 1869-1870, into harmony with the advanced results of physical science, the stern conclusions of literary criticism, and the modern world view.

Drews and Loisy practically stand upon the same ground. Drews has made it known that his essay, *The Christmyth,* is not directed against Christianity as a whole, but against the "Liberal Theology" which erases everything religious from the Jesus-portrait, and yet wishes to be Christian and religious with the residue. Jesus as a merely historical individual, according to the conception of the Liberal Theology, sinks to the level of any other great historical personality, and where this happens the world can dispense with Him also in a religious sense. Drews does not reject Christianity, but only "Jesusism," as he is pleased to call it. "The desire for salvation burns in the soul. While the theologians labour upon the restoration of their Jesus-portrait, are we to feel satisfied that under the hands of every theological professor the portrait receives some other form? We need the Presence of God and of Divinity, but not His bygones, His past manifestations. The essential in Christianity may be retained, but it must be unfolded further, not backward, beneath and behind intervening dogmas to the so-called historical Christ, but forward,

* St. John 8:36.

above and beyond the dogmas, to the immanent Christ, to the enlargement of the idea of the God-Man into the idea of Theanthropic Humanity. To awaken this consciousness, Drews tells his friends, *The Christmyth* was written.* By endorsing the radical views of Loisy, who in many respects differs from Drews only in the positive character of the atmosphere of an idealistic, mystical faith, churchly in type, Tixeront virtually undermines and discredits the whole superstructure of his apologetic *History of Dogmas,* which, with such marvellous industry, profound erudition, and exceptional literary acumen, he has assembled, systematized, and elaborated from the wide and varied field of Ante-Nicene and Early Patristic Literature.

The Abbé Loisy draws a distinction between the Jesus of History and the Christ of the Church. It has been said that Origen, the memorable apologist of Christianity against Celsus, and the Coryphean dogmatist and textual critic of the Alexandrian School, allegorized the Old Testament, and that David Frederic Strauss, called the romanticist of heathenism, allegorized the New Testament. It is a fact, however, that Origen applied the allegorical method of interpretation to the Bible as a whole, but he lived in a totally different philosophical atmosphere, which grew out of a union of the Platonic doctrine of the " World Soul," the Stoical idea of the " Supreme Reason," and the Logos doctrine of Philo, the Jew.† *Logos* in the

* Dr. Arthur Drews, Private Correspondence, May, 1910. Karl Noll, *Der Kampf um die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu,* p. 58.

† Böhringer, *Die Kirche Christi,* Vol. V, p. 2.

Greek language means both reason and word. From that philosophical vantage ground Origen moved onward in his labours, in defence and promulgation of the Christocentric faith.

But Strauss (1808-1874) was a follower of the great German philosopher, Hegel, and ultimately landed in Materialism. Though he was the son of a minister, and though he himself had been a pastor,

The father of David Friedrich Strauss was a small tradesman of limited capital, who, with his family, would have been more successful in business had not adverse circumstances and imprudent investments caused him to suffer serious losses which injured the standing of the family and brought unhappiness into the home. Though not a pastor, as stated by mistake in this volume, the father of David Friedrich Strauss was intellectual and studious in his tastes and habits. In addition to the modern poets, he read the writings of Horace, Ovid and Virgil in the original Latin, and when he travelled he took with him the work of some favorite author, withdrawing the while to some seat alone in a public garden to read and to meditate. He was not an unbeliever, but a mystic of the Jung Stilling type.

See: David Friedrich Strauss in seinem Leben und seinen Schriften, von Eduard Zeller, Seite 5.

says: "There is nowhere an example adequate to the idea." * Karl Friedrich Göschel, a famous contemporary opponent of Strauss, says it was known that Strauss did not consider the Gospel history as real history, or as objective truth, but only as the subjective act of the human consciousness, which in part involuntarily and in part purposely gives sensible expression

*Kant, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft,* p. 501. Reclam Ed., Leipzig. Kant, *Religion innerh. der Graenzen der blosen Vernunft.* S.63-82.

in objective myths to the idea of the divine-humanity resident in it, until, as in the case of a liar who deceives himself with his own fictions, and finally believes them—particular fancies, particular veilings of a merely universal truth are received again as honest coin, and assert themselves as historic events. According to Strauss, therefore, the Gospel history, in Kantian terminology, is nothing more than a subreption of the hypostatized consciousness, except that he gives this hypostatizing process a groundwork which is to become an objective truth in the whole human race, while the ascription of it to the man Christus is only an illusion of the senses. Thus Strauss does not find the Christ-Idea as the God-Man in a single person, but in man as a genus, or generically, and this not as it is now, or in any particular point of time, but only in the endless, never concluding progression in which the totality of the concept unfolds itself. He gives the subjective idea of the God-Man an objective foundation of truth, but denies to it individual truth, and seeks its realization in the endless future.

The investigations of the writer in connection with this profound subject led him to send to Germany for a number of books and pamphlets by Göschel, Schaller, and Frauenstädt, called forth in the early part of the nineteenth century by the appearance of Strauss' *Leben Jesu.* They are of great value in their bearing upon a controversy which involves the assailment and defence of Historic Christianity in the more immediate past, in the present hour, and in the long years to come.*

* Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy,* Vol. II, p. 294.

Dr. Karl Friedrich Göschel's name is found in the list of Hegelians recorded in Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy,* but he belongs to the right wing of the Hegelian School, because he opposes the destructive historic criticism of Strauss and his followers. The left wing of the Hegelian School also questions the historicity of the Gospel narratives, and, in agreement with Naturalism, eliminates the miraculous element from both the objective and subjective sides of Christianity. Karl Ludwig Michelet, for example, an eminent member of this wing of the school, says that the Absolute first arrives at consciousness in man, and that humanity is the "epiphany of the eternal personality of the (absolute) spirit."

Göschel's book, *Gott, Christus, und Mensch* (Berlin, 1838), though belonging to the bypaths of philosophy, is an able refutation of the fundamental error of Strauss, and a worthy defence of Hegel against Naturalistic Rationalism. He says that any one who does not believe in the miraculous, in the distinction, or antinomy, between the spirit and nature, cannot be helped by miracles alone. Therefore Rationalism, which denies regeneration because it is a miracle, because it is in like manner contradictory of, and impossible in, Nature, must seek refuge in the Spirit, from which the wonders of Nature come forth, which gives man birth, and by which he is to be born again. At the same time the manifestations of the miraculous, miracles in general, sink into comparative insignificance in the presence of the greatest of all miracles, the Person and Life of Jesus, the sign of the prophet

Jonah.* It is the method of modern faith to sever and emancipate the Scriptures from the Church,† the teaching of Scripture from the teaching of the Church, the word from the symbol, symbol from dogma, and dogma from philosophy. This abstraction of the Christian faith from its historical development, a method peculiar to our time, also has had the effect of reducing the doctrine of the Trinity to the level of the human understanding. It is known that Strauss could not find real history in the Synoptic narratives, nor any objective truth, but only a subjective act of the human consciousness, which the indwelling Idea of the theanthropic humanity, in part involuntarily, in part purposely, unfolds and projects in the mental life of man.

From the side of philosophy, for he laid claim to fellowship there, Strauss was reminded that his cognitive theory of the understanding, limited to the representative faculty *(Vorstellungs Ansicht)*, does not rise above the sphere of Naturalism. The passage from the sphere of Nature to the kingdom of the Spirit he failed to grasp, since the spiritual individual, like the natural individual, is to him neither more nor less than an exponent of the genus, or race. He seems to have followed his master in philosophy no further than to the border of Nature, which closes with the death of the individual. Here he left his guide, and bade farewell to the further development of philosophy. Then the critical school of Baur concluded its criticism of the critique of Strauss in these words:

* Göschel, *Gott, Christus, und Mensch*, p. 41.
† *Idem*, p. 12.

"Criticism moves forward from the notion of the individual to the idea of personality, to which idea on the whole the progress of science is unalterably bound, and where the rift between the idea and the appearance will find its cloture." * Göschel emphasizes the fact that here in a striking way the pivotal point is shown where philosophy takes the thread of further concrete development, in order to vanquish the negative criticism of the human understanding. Strauss himself admitted that he recognized this forward movement, and in some of his last writings he made a confession somewhat as follows: "I, too, do not believe merely in an ideal Christ. Christ is to me also an objective Person. I find this Person in the race, in mankind. All humanity is Christ. Christ therefore is more than every individual man, and differs from every separate individual, for He is mankind as a whole. For this very reason the historic Christ is not the true Christ, because he is a single individual, and not the race as a whole. But neither Rationalists, nor Supernaturalists, nor philosophers, can see this universal Personality of Jesus, because genus is only genus to them. They cannot rise high enough in thought to look upon genus as personality, to contemplate collectivity as unity." Göschel shows that this position agrees almost literally with Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason,* and with his *Religion within the Limits of the Natural Reason.* Kant says: Humanity in its morally complete perfection alone is *that* man, well pleasing to God, who is in Him from

* *Jahrbuecher fuer Wissentschaftliche Kritik,* 1836, Bd. I, s. 704.

eternity, the idea of whom proceeds from His being, who is no created thing, but God's eternal Son.

In his historical criticism of modern theology, which follows, Göschel clearly defines two great provinces of research. "Evidential proof is the nerve of Apologetics. Doubt is the nerve of Criticism. Both of these lie outside of the subjects with which they deal. The nerve of Apologetics is essentially external evidential proof. The nerve of Criticism is doubt, which in like manner externally denies the external proof, but being itself outside its object, has as little power to break down as it has to construct. On the other hand, the philosophy of history is immanent in history. It is history itself, as the unfolding of the Spirit." * According to Martensen, Criticism is the eye in which the times are subjectively coloured, and dialectic is the eye in which they are objectively mirrored. Thus the philosophy of history is one with its object. External negation thus attains glorification in her truth, namely, through the dialectic of her development immanent in history. Criticism follows the path of negation step by step to affirm itself. Herewith apologetic proof of (its) truth glorifies itself in speculative philosophy, for history is not demonstrated, but renders its own proof of itself. It is the spirit which beareth witness to our spirit.†

The residue of the positive content of the spirit which negative criticism retains, and with which it hopes to outlive its ruin, to heal its hurt, to cover its nakedness, is the conclusion that the true Jesus is not

* Pp. 46, 47.

† P. 48. See also p. 52.

a single individual, but dies as such forever, and rises again racially. The negative content then amounts to this, that Jesus is not the Christ. This does not simply mean, which every Christian must affirm, that in the thirty-third year of the life of Christ Christology was not exhausted. On the contrary, the declaration is boldly made by negative criticism that Jesus is not the Christ. Therefore the remnant of positive truth, all that is left of a positive content of historic truth, is that all mankind constitutes the Christ. The new theology teaches that the true Christ, on the whole, was not a single, particular man, and for the reason that singleness, individuality, particularity, is not adequate to universality, to the Idea. All mankind is Christ. This agrees in a measure with the orthodox conception that to Christ must be ascribed the whole of humanity in its fulness and integrity, as well as the Godhead. For this reason also the Church predicates of and assigns to Christ *humanitas plena, humanitas divina.*

The new theology proclaims that Christ is humanity, therefore mankind, therefore the sum of all individual human beings, and nothing less than henceforth and forever Christ. This is His eternity. Thus since man is created in the image of God, he is also called to likeness with God through salvation, and salvation is consummated as an objective fact by the implanting of Christ in the whole of humanity, and is carried down in all its members from generation to generation. Therefore not in any one individual, but in all men taken together, it unfolds to the general concept of the perfect man. Hence Christ also is the

idea which lies at the foundation of every human consciousness, without coming to realization in any one individual. Objectively the Christ-idea is immanent in the human consciousness, but only the idea, which no one separately brings to realization, but only the race as a whole at the end of the ages. In other words, objectively the world is saved; but because objectively, therefore only potentially, for the reality of the spirit is the unity of subject and object. But it will be saved subjectively only by the acceptance of the Idea implanted in the consciousness, and carried forward by a process of successive unfoldment. This acceptance and development are faith, and growth in faith. In these particulars the new theology cannot be challenged as heretical. The great question is, whether this Jesus, or Christus, implanted in the consciousness of men, and increasing in wisdom, age, and grace, is only the idea still to be realized, or whether, moreover, not merely a moral, an ethical, but also a real, historical Personality lies at its foundation, is its source and inspiration, and in accordance with whom the idea of mankind, of perfect manhood, is to be realized.*

Göschel quotes Philalethes † as saying that the Christ of Strauss possesses more tangible reality than the Christ of vulgar Rationalism, since Strauss understands by his Christ a substantial concept, the race concept of mankind, who has being in the same, and therefore conditions, in a sense predetermines, the individual

* *Gott, Christus, und Mensch,* p. 55.

† *Zwei Gespräche in Beziehung auf das Leben Jesu von Strauss.* Leipzig, 1836.

man. But according to Rationalism Christ lies dead in an unmarked, forgotten corner of Palestine, His immortal spirit abides as a "thing-in-itself" far away from these scenes, on some fixed star perhaps, and His teaching shines dimly on, without His living presence, like a *caput mortuum* of abstraction, only greatly distorted and darkened in the chaos of superstition, and only now and again unearthed and further unfolded by occasional wise men of the passing centuries. It cannot be denied, Göschel holds, that every man, as such, carries Christ in his heart, his Christ, and that every Christian unfolds and personifies the Idea in his individuality. We take it that he means men are not born under a decree of unalterable condemnation, without any possibility at all of being reached by the Gospel. Therefore, he adds, in relation to the view of Strauss, one may say that Bethlehem and Golgotha renew themselves in the individual heart, and the human consciousness realizes itself in man as God's consciousness, and God-consciousness as consciousness of childship with God. In so far the human heart is not only Bethlehem and Golgotha, but also the "Word" that is "with God." In so far the Christ-idea is inscribed in and to be represented by every man, and to be realized in the whole human race. Holy Scripture also pleads and urges that Christ shall obtain an abiding Presence in us (formetur, μορφωθή, Galatians 4: 19). Strauss ascribes personality to the race, not only to man individually, but as a whole. This Göschel concedes to be a great, rich, deep thought, but he maintains that it proves its final inadequacy by its lack of the germ of life, since the

theory of Strauss denies to it individuality, that is to say, subjective personality. Therefore there is ascribed to the human race only moral, ideal, or mystical personality.

According to its true conception, to complete personal individuality there belongs of necessity the individuality of the subject. Individuality is inseparable from the concept of personality. Personality must necessarily lie at the foundation of individuals in the human family. Individuals and persons in the race have centralized in them individuality, subjectivity, and personality, and through this avenue alone can the universal again and again reach, or arrive at individuality and personality. It is impossible for any man to be a person without being an individual. This progress of the concept is lacking in the Christology of Strauss, and one misses it also in the Hegelian philosophy. Thus the Christ-thought, indwelling in faith, and which is the soul of faith, arises, in obedience to the law resident in it, by its own way, by the path which it must follow, and which leads one back to faith, to faith in the real Personality of Christ, who, like every one else, possesses personal individuality, and unlike every one else, possesses totality. As the Head of the same, He is not conditioned by, but Himself conditions, His community of believers. He sustains and saves it, through communion with Him, who also created it.* Though independent, as the primal man, of humanity, and unconditioned by it, but conditioning and interpenetrating it, nevertheless His kingdom among men is dependent upon them, to the

* *Gott, Christus, und Mensch,* p. 58.

degree in which they are *free*. His monarchy and dominion will be perfect only then when all the members of His kingdom, who are called, permit him to permeate them. This dependence of Christ becomes actualized in history. History therefore is not only a parable of the Idea, but its realization; not a painting without content, but *history*. In thought Christ is immediately known as an historical Person, then as ideal Person, and lastly as both in full integrity. With the reality of His Personality mankind again receives its real and proper Head, Guide, and Exemplar.

Another interesting and profound answer to Strauss proceeded from the pen of Dr. Julius Schaller, privat docent in the University of Halle. It is entitled *The Historical Christ and Philosophy, a Critique of the Fundamental Idea of the Life of Christ by Dr. D. F. Strauss,* and was published in Leipzig in April, 1838, making a little volume of one hundred and thirty-seven closely printed pages.

In the first chapter the author discusses the mythical conception of the Synoptical History as to its tendency in general, and in relation to faith. Here he says that the coming of Christ stands out in all history as a fact of world historical significance, because with the faith in Christ a new consciousness concerning the possession of existence arose in mankind. Thus the individual element in the Gospel history solely and alone obtains, or receives, its essential meaning in relation to the Person of Christ, and first through this relation becomes the content of faith. The second chapter treats of the mythical view in its essential moments. The third chapter deals with the separation

of man from God as the presupposition of atonement. The fourth chapter is devoted to the criticism of the Christology of Strauss. The subject of the fifth chapter is the Idea of Atonement, and of the sixth chapter the Personality of Christ. In the seventh chapter the author inquires into the history of Christ, and in the eighth he treats of faith, the Christian life, and philosophy. Above all else, the author maintains, the fact is to be emphasized that Christ Himself can never and nowhere be a mythical person, presenting and meaning something else than Himself. On the contrary, Christ is the interpretation of the *mythus,* or myth, the actually existing explanation of the same, hence the elevation of the mythical to reality in the absolute unity of form and content. As soon as one makes of Christ Himself a myth, one rejects the revealed infinite freedom of the individual subject, and therewith loses sight of the essential content of the Christian religion. All mythical elements in the Gospel history, therefore, have their universal historical basis in the Person of Christ, and arose from the faith in Him, from the most intimate apprehension of His character, and the inspired apprehension of His divine Personality. Instead of marring the Gospel history, these elements give completeness to it, and show forth its spiritual significance and eternal verity.

Julius Frauenstädt, a mild Hegelian, who afterward transferred his allegiance to Schopenhauer, in 1839 published an interesting essay of one hundred and forty-five pages, entitled *Die Menschwerdung Gottes,* or "How God Became Man, the possibility, reality, and necessity of it, with special reference to

Strauss, Schaller, and Göschel." This essay is a production of great ability, and is characterized by keen analytical reasoning and searching constructive power. The literary style is chaste, and the flow of thought, especially in the opening chapter, is commanding in its forcefulness and inspiring in warmth.

"What is the God-Man?" he asks. (Preface, p. 4.) Is it a *compositum* of God and man? or since this would be essentially a coarse, mechanical, unspiritual conception, are God and Man only moments of the God-Man as a higher third? Are therefore God and Man by themselves false conceptions, abstractions, which, since only the whole is the truth, find their truth in the God-Man? But what kind of God would He be who would only momentarily be in a higher, since He Himself is to be thought the highest, and everything else only a moment in Him? What kind of God would He be who would have His truth in a higher, since all else is to have its truth in Him? Let it be granted that God and Man, taken alone, are only abstractions of thought, and that there exists in truth only the God-Man. Are then the theanthropic individuals examples merely of the genus or idea of theanthropic humanity, or do they spring from a primal God-Man? And if they spring from a primal God-Man, is the theanthropic primal individual perhaps the God-Man Christus? All these and a multitude of other equally difficult questions find their solution in, and are disposed of by, the concept of the manward motion of God.

Frauenstädt sums up his criticism of Strauss and Schaller as follows: These two views of the realiza-

tion of the idea of theanthropic humanity seem to be antagonistic to, and to exclude each other, for while Strauss asserts that the idea of theanthropic humanity does not realize itself in one, but in all, Schaller teaches the exact opposite. All are not one, and one is not all. Hence Strauss and Schaller appear to be unreconcilable. But, more closely studied, their contradiction is such in seeming only, for Strauss denies that the idea of theanthropic humanity ever realizes itself in one individual, and Schaller merely denies that it realizes itself in all mankind alone. Neither one lacks both moments or factors in the unfolding of theanthropic humanity, but they seem to contradict each other, because in Strauss the moment of individuality in the particular spheres of life is pressed into the background by generalization in religion. In the reasoning of Schaller, on the contrary, the moment of generalization in the religious sphere is minimized by the contemplation of particularity, individuality, and personality in the sphere of religion. In view of this mediating relation between the Christology of Strauss and Schaller, Frauenstädt holds that the complete content of the Incarnation of God lies open before the eye of the soul. The Incarnation of God, consistently with the Idea, is not *incarnation,* but *God*-Incarnation *(Gottmenschwerdung)*, and this again is not simple, but concrete in idea, confining itself neither to religion nor to any particular sphere of life, rather interpenetrating both and all. While the incarnation of God in the sphere of religion is the same in every individual, since every individual receives the same unitary and undivided God-consciousness, it still is

differentiated, or varied, in all the spheres of life, in Church and State, because individuals, communities, and associations receive particular charisms. These organic relations are defined in the parable of Christ: "I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringth forth much fruit; for without Me ye can do nothing."

However, this idea of theanthropic humanity in the full is not only complex, but also progressive, and does not exist in immediate tangible perfection. It unfolds itself by an extended process, which is the history of the world. History is the unfolding of the objective universal spirit of mankind. Mankind is a community destined to represent the kingdom of God.*

Frauenstädt in his criticism of Göschel's position, charges him with hyperorthodoxy, and declares it to be positively depressing and distressing that the pearls of philosophy should be thrown into the mire by the assertion that "Christ was the preadamic man, the primal man, after whom man as we know him in the world of nature was created, and by whom he is saved. As Christ was man in Himself before the beginning of time, so He became man in time and in the flesh." † Frauenstädt concedes it to be a well-known principle in philosophy that every individual member, yes, he adds, the most wretched, the poorest, the most unworthy member of one genus is worth more than the whole next lower genus; that even the most insignificant human being stands higher than this in-

* Frauenstädt, *Die Menschwerdung Gottes*, p. 51. Berlin, 1839.
† Matthew 11: 11.

dividual, than the whole universe of nature, with all its starry heavens, world systems, and milky ways. This superiority of the humblest member of a higher sphere over the whole subordinate lower order Christ recognizes when He says: "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." In further elucidation of his viewpoint, he quotes the following passage from Hegel: "Every image of the mind, the worst of its fancies, the play of its most fortuitous moods, every word possesses more value as ground for the being of God, than any object in nature. When spiritual caprice moves on to positive evil, even then it occupies an infinitely higher plane than the wandering of the stars, in conformity to law, or the innocence of plants, for that which thus errs is spirit." *

But does it follow from this relation that Jesus of Nazareth, the historical Christ, towers sublimely above all mankind?—that He *is* the race of man?—that we on the contrary only *have* human nature?—that He was the totality of all, before they became individualized?—that He was the impersonal, primal beginning of men from eternity, and that all men are created by Him?—that He was man in Himself before Adam, and became flesh and fellow man? In contrast with this negative attitude, Göschel says that in the law of evolution, which makes the first individual of the genus the beginning, not the end or climax of the process of unfolding, according to which the de-

* Hegel, *Encyclopedia,* Third Edition, p. 228.

scent moves forward, and in so far ascends, the first man is affected, but not the primal, the ideal man, who is not the beginning, but the originator of this succession, and hence not subject to it. But does it follow from this that Jesus of Nazareth, Frauenstädt again asks, the empirical, historical Christ, who in history only begins the succession of the self-conscious, theanthropic humanity, and therefore as such stands out only as the first in this succession, is the primal man, and the author or prototype of the human race? He declares that the historical Christ is neither the primal man, nor the attained goal of history, but as the middle, the mediator, and pivotal-point of all history, he is the beginning of the end.* Hence the actual God-Man exists only through the power of the Idea of theanthropic humanity. When Christ says to the Father: "For Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world," he has reference to the eternal idea of theanthropic humanity, to realize which God created the world, and means that to mediate this realization He sent Christ into the world, when the fulness of time had come.†

Frauenstädt contends that the pre- and extra-mundane existence of Christ as a real and self-conscious Person destroys the peculiar difference between Christ and us, for thereby the figure of the Saviour and Reconciler is pushed back into a hazy distance, a great gulf is fixed between us, and His redeeming power and activity are paralyzed. These are the strongest then when we have the consciousness that

* *Die Menschwerdung Gottes*, pp. 56, 57.
† St. John 17:24.

He was like us in all things, and found perfect as a man as we are. Through this separation and gulf those who emphasize so urgently the difference between Him and us annul the real difference, and do the very opposite of what they wish to do. Christ's difference in relation to other men falls within the world border, for His world position, His mediatorship, is the specific difference between Him and us. The aim of it, however, is to remove the distinction between us, and to restore our likeness and unity with Him. The distinction therefore is not to be a material but a formal one, like the difference between cause and effect, and not a difference of content, but only a difference of form.* Frauenstädt seems to ignore the original sinfulness of man and his ethical and spiritual estrangement from God, and by implication appears to deny the sinlessness of Christ, which certainly amounts to far more than a formal distinction. But such a defect in the process of reasoning is to be expected in a pantheistic interpretation of the universe.

The mythological Christology, according to which the community is Christ-creating, has been correctly given the reverse answer that Christ is a community-builder. But one may further elucidate the process by asking whether by the community-constructing Christ, the historical or the ideal, the historically presented, or only ideally manifested God-Man, is to be understood; or whether, for the salvation of the human race, the real God-Man is at all necessary? In other words, is the λόγος ἐνδιαθετὸς or the λόγος

*Die Menschwerdung Gottes*, p. 59.

πορφυρὸς, the redeeming principle?* "I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one," is the sublime utterance of Christ, because in it, the author says, the whole content of the actual Incarnation of God is concentred, in consequential harmony with his argument in the foregoing pages of the booklet.†

Frauenstädt accepts the doctrine of the Trinity as the deepest principle of the true, the good, and the beautiful, and declares it to possess practical significance and power in the profoundest sense, but he departs from the orthodox, or Nicene position, by representing the Trinity to consist of God, Man, and the Spirit, the higher third, by whose agency the Father and the Son, that is to say, Man, are united, and through whose reception man becomes God-Man. He holds that in a tri-personal Trinity God rends Himself asunder when He enters as a second Ego into man.‡ "If the Ego can become everything, only not thou and he, how can the divine Ego become thou and he in the human Ego, without ceasing to be Ego? This is the first great antinomy. It is an impassable gulf in the Godhead.|| That a creature godlike in being; that in the creation there should be a spiritual, personal, self-conscious being; that God's non-Ego is again itself Ego, is absolutely incomprehensible, is the absolute miracle.§ Religion possesses the certainty of the reality and necessity of the divine Incar-

* Frauenstädt, *Die Menschwerdung Gottes*, p. 60.
† P. 64.
‡ P. 109.
|| P. 119.
§ *Die Menschwerdung Gottes*, p. 130.

nation. Philosophy testifies that it is impossible for God to become Man. Faith and knowledge, or religion and philosophy, paralyze each other mutually. If faith gives me the comforting certainty of the reality of the Incarnation of God, then philosophy whispers the impossibility of it to me. And again when philosophy seeks to rob me of that precious certainty, it is silenced by the still small voice of faith. So faith and knowledge are engaged in an endless warfare, and my soul is the scene of this unceasing battle.

In a former work, entitled *The Freedom of Man and the Personality of God, a Contribution to the Fundamental Problems of Present Day Speculation,* (Berlin, May, 1838), the same author pursues a similar line of thought. He there seeks to establish a hopeless antinomy between divine and human personality, and claims that the Absolute Idea of Hegel, which its exponents profess to be the key that unlocks the whole universe, shatters upon this antinomy. Dr. G. A. Gabler, professor of philosophy in the University of Berlin, also an Hegelian, at the request of the author wrote a review of the work in the form of a prefatory letter, which is incorporated in the pamphlet. "Finite spirit you yourself say," Dr. Gabler answers, "is a contradiction. We admit it and that it is here. But this contradiction, ideally endless, but really limited, and hampered by a multitude of barriers, also contains the impulse and dialectic impact of the spirit to free itself from this finiteness, and to realize its infinite idea. To this end the spirit must first pass through a series of stages, negative in action,

in relation to its immediate but not yet realized idea and self-determining existence, to dissolve it and to reach an expression commensurate with the Idea. The end of this development, and the removal of the contradiction, therefore, is the return to God, and the mergence again into the Absolute Spirit.*

With Hegel, in the logical transition from substance to concept, from necessity to freedom, substantiality itself, conceived in its purpose as *causa sui,* unquestionably passes over into the idea, the higher, but without the loss of the substantial content. The fact is recognized, moreover, that the concept fixes the content, and is the principle of necessity in determinations, whereby all former logical determinations themselves now arrive at truth, by returning into the Idea. There they are also projected in the form of the concept, in whose ideality, so to speak, they become pliant and flowing, and lose all hardness, one-sidedness, and stiffness which they had before. It is the absolute reflection of absolute thought in itself, and its conception of itself, its mastery and grasp of itself as freedom. The logical Ego of the Spirit in its truth is absolutely not without the substantial content of the reason, and associated with it in inseparable unity.†

Dr. Gabler does not find that philosophy is necessitated to contradict the teachings of religion. It all depends upon the possibility of reconciling the opposites, the self-determined essential and the dependent essential, so that they do not only meet each other

* Gabler, *Letter,* p. 18.
† Dr. Gabler, *Letter,* p. 20.

in the spirit in general, but also in the spiritual ego, and thus remove the contradiction.*

The truth which we find, recognize, and realize in ourselves does not as such belong to our formal Ego, but to God, and has become a reality to us, as an imparted possession, through the substantial self-existent content of the Spirit. While in such a content we have indeed its own self-relation to ourselves, or our Ego, it is no doubt correct that in the sphere of its inner truth, lying at its foundation, the Ego has moved forward. Yet since God is this Truth, it would be more accurate to say that we have personally come nearer to God, and that what we have won in reality and in being is GOD, than if we were to reverse the process and say that God has thereby realized Himself, and become active in us, or even that He has become conscious of Himself in us.

If the contradiction described by Frauenstädt really existed, Dr. Gabler continues, as a contradiction, then Christ must have made a self-contradictory declaration concerning His own inner being when He said: "As the Father hath life in Himself, even so He hath also given the Son to have life in Himself," meaning the same life, therefore, as that of the Father, and yet imparted. Dr. Gabler adds: "This passage, on the contrary, has always impressed me profoundly in support of the absolute Personality of the Son, without at all causing the elimination of the Father as the original and primal source. It seems to me that Christ, who besides called Himself unqualifiedly the Son of Man, wished thereby also to indicate

* Pp. 22, 24.

His differentiation from the rest of mankind, in whom the eternal, the divine, or absolute life does not dwell so unqualifiedly, but in whom it must first be awakened by Him.

In like manner it seems to me that the *Homousia* of the Son with the Father is taught in this passage, without destroying the distinction of a twofold Personality. How else can we reconcile this distinction, in contrast with the other saying of Christ: "I and the Father are one." The Son in respect of his Personality claims the same absolute content of the divine essence as referred to Himself. But this Personality of the eternal Logos, begotten unto self-determining Sonship, is no longer that of the Father, but the second other self."

# IX

## RECENT REVIVALS OF THE MYTHICAL THEORY

THE controversy we have here reviewed was renewed in 1911 in Germany, and is in progress at the present time. The men engaged in it pursue similar paths of criticism, negation, and apologetic defence, but the spirit in which they labour is characterized by an unusual degree of personal independence. Herman Jordan of Erlangen says that he does not know of any period in the history of Christianity in which so many different views were expressed concerning Jesus, and in which the historical figure of Jesus was so differently portrayed as at this present time. An immense flood of Jesus-literature followed the first appearance of the *Life of Jesus* by David Strauss, but it is comparatively easy to point out a few fixed types of Jesus-portraits in that time, which, while trending in one direction or another, dominated the general form of presentation. Since then a marked change has taken place in the realm of thought. Because of the individualistic subjectivism of the present time, it is difficult to choose fixed typical portraitures of Jesus from the vast number of contributions to the literature upon the subject in our day, and to assemble and

classify all other related material accordingly. Excepting where Jesus is denied outright, a thing which seldom occurs, one may almost say that as a man is, so is his Jesus, for every one reads his own ethical and religious, social and esthetical views into the historical Jesus-portrait. Even those who question the historicity of Jesus fashion a Christus for themselves, a Christ-type which is the pure creation, or resultant, of their own world view. In the judgment of Dr. Jordan, if this is already true of the scientific and semi-scientific Jesus-literature, it is true in the highest degree of the literary and poetic portrayals of Jesus. These various schools of thought, based upon the central figure of the Gospels, are faithfully described and thoroughly examined by Dr. Johannes Leipolt, professor of theology in the University of Kiel, in a learned and able book, entitled *The Jesus-Portrait of To-day* (Vom Jesusbild der Gegenwart, Leipzig, 1913).

One of the chief figures in the controversy concerning the historicity of Jesus is Dr. Arthur Drews, an American by birth, a monistic idealist, who in less objectionable form and with a new colorit advocates the mythical theory of David Strauss, and teaches philosophy in Berlin. In his opening address at a religious discussion held in that city on March 11, 1911, Drews reviews the assertion that it is of no importance to the religious Christian life whether Jesus lived or not. The ethical truth and religious significance of the New Testament narratives and thought, he says, are independent of the existence of an historical Jesus. Hitherto that faith only has been

called Christian which accepts Christ as the vicarious, historical God-Man. The Christian religion stands or falls with the pivotal doctrine that the metaphysical process of salvation is organically associated with an historical event of supreme moment. Any one who denies this does not know what Christianity is, or tries to evade an unpleasant problem by withdrawing to neutral ground. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that a tremendous agitation has been caused by the recent denial of the historicity of Jesus, and the assertion that his figure belongs to the realm of myth, for thereby He sinks to the level of the heathen Saviour-gods, because of the loss of the distinguishing feature of His historical character. On the other hand, if Jesus was an historical Personage at all, He could under no circumstances be such an one as orthodoxy claims Him to have been.

Liberalism, says Drews, as the result of literary criticism, declares the historical Jesus to have been a man like other men, but undoubtedly the most exalted, the greatest, and the best of men. The New Testament accounts, however, exhibit an entirely different Christ, namely, the God-Man of orthodoxy. Meanwhile the "Liberal Theologians" who believe it to be possible to exhume the figure of the real Jesus from the mythologic hypercolouration of the Synoptic environment, and who confidently speak of the "primitive rock," of the "granite-bed," which they claim to have uncovered by their critical researches, themselves admittedly fail in the effort to construct an adequate Jesus-portrait from the fragments which they utilize, and which they strive in vain to knit together

into a unitary, all-sufficient whole. Therefore to quarrel with Liberalism over the question whether Jesus ever lived or not is useless.* The purely human Jesus, as the absolute moral ideal, the ethical example of all ages, cannot help us. With the acceptance of His mere humanity, His limitation historically and in character, is conceded. This makes it unreasonable to ascribe absolute ethical importance to a single historical individual. If we explain Jesus as the realized moral ideal, we overlook the fact that ideas as such can never be real. Or is it not the essence of the ideal ever to be only the idea which determines conduct, which changes with outward relations, which alters, deepens, and unfolds further, with the spiritual maturity of individuals and nations?

The assertion that the ethical ideal was realized in the historical Jesus of "Liberal Theology" cannot be proved historically. If, however, Jesus was an historical Personage, and the embodiment of the highest human attributes, He was this directly through His relation to God, through the inner and "unique" attitude in which He "knew" Himself to stand to His heavenly "Father." His view of God and the world, therefore, the thoughts He had concerning the meaning of existence, in connection with His inherited ethical genius, determined His ethical greatness. If the same ethical powers slumber in me, and you, says Drews, and if we can awaken them in ourselves on the ground of related views, then we may hope to approach Jesus in ethical respects. But if we do this,

* *Lebt Jesus? Reden über den "historischen Jesus und die Religion."* März den 12ten, 1911. Berlin und Leipzig.

it is also needless, for the same reason, to ask what kind of man Jesus was, what kind of thoughts He had, and whether He really ever lived, because we cannot under any circumstances appropriate His sentiments. We can only elevate our own native talent to the height attained by Him. The most adorable attributes one may ascribe to Jesus, His aboriginal, dynamic God-consciousness, His unsurpassed love of men, His confidence in the triumph of the good, His humility, patience, and devotion, as mere objective facts, cannot, as such, contribute anything to our subjective salvation. On this ground Drews rejects the binding authority of the ethical ideal in Jesus, and declares himself free to follow any other historic individual, like Socrates, Buddha, and Laotse. He makes this declaration with astonishing indifference to the fact that not one of the great ethnic teachers of mankind rises either historically or mythically to the plane of even the purely human Jesus-portrait of Liberalism.

Drews argues that the religious impulse in man, working as the ethical will, as so-called grace in individuals, which also binds them together with its background of divine being, may be designated as Jesus, or Christ. Only this "inner" Jesus has nothing to do with the pious Rabbi of Nazareth, who as a wandering teacher and prophet in Galilee healed the sick, preached the Gospel, died, and was buried in Jerusalem. *That* Christ who really lives, and is to-day an individually active, saving power, bearing witness in the heart of the believer, is not the historical, but the ideal Christ, as expressed in the formulas of the

Church, and identified with the Holy Spirit. In other words, it is nothing else than the divine essentiality and activity in man, which, in religious conception, constitutes a necessary, elemental part of all men, whether Jesus lived or not, in history. The Spirit which works and acts in me, says Drews further, the Spirit to which I owe my freedom from the world of Nature, my inner self-existence, is the same Spirit who also lived in Christ. So far also, and in this sense, this Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, but it is true only in the sense in which the Spirit dwells in every human creature, and makes possible the triumph of the individual over Nature. If God, as such, is the inmost kernel, the true Self, the sustaining foundation of man, then the inner independence of man in relation to Nature is safeguarded, and man is himself in inner connection with the Godhead only then when he draws all his power from the consciousness of this union, and is empowered through his own inner being to triumph over Nature, in keeping with his true spiritual self, or, as stated in the language of religion, to be redeemed.

In the last analysis, in Christianity also it is not Christ at all, but the Holy Spirit dwelling in Him, through whom the salvation of man is accomplished. The act of salvation in Christianity is not a salvation of the Ego through itself, but of the Ego through the Self, the background of Divine Being in man, which is one with the Holy Ghost, and hence in this sense self-salvation. This being the case, one cannot see why salvation must make the détour of the supposedly historic Christ, and therefore, Drews contends, faith

in Him also from this angle of vision is superfluous for the salvation of mankind. We are told in return that this is a mere idea, and not a reality, and that faith in the ideal Christ is vain, if the real Christ never lived. But religion on the whole, Drews answers, lives only from ideas. That Jesus died for us, and works on in the form of Spirit, is an idea. The desire to see the truth of this Idea given credibility through the historic Jesus commits one to a plumper materialism than all the materialistic shortsightedness with which the Monists are charged. One needs only to be courageous enough to seize the idea, instead of clinging any longer to an uncertain historical reality, which, if it ever did exist, is of no account fundamentally to religious persons like ourselves, and then one will realize that man only lives in and unfolds from the idea, providing that this is actually commensurate with his innermost ideal being. Liberalism simply reaps the consequences of its own half-hearted insufficiency, of its desire and effort to remain in the Church, and to be accounted Christian, without granting to Christ a dominant and decisive significance in the process of salvation.

Liberalism seeks to develop religion further, and to bring it into consonance with modern science, and the modern world view, by separating Jesus entirely from all connection with any world view whatsoever, and levelling the whole of religion to a mere "Jesus-cult." Such a misinterpretation and voiding of the content of original Christianity is simply not religious enough. Therefore the fate of this tendency leaves us cold, for we cannot hope for any progress from it, nor

from its destruction of the historicity of all faith. All religion, Drews continues, is a life out of the depths of one's own immediate self, an activity in the Spirit and in freedom. All religious progress completes itself in the deepening of faith, in the transposition of the centre of gravity of Being, from the objective to the subjective world, and in confident, trustful resignation to the God within us. Faith in the historical mediatorial Saviour is only an external acceptance of objective facts as true. It will not suffice to found the religious life upon them. One must grasp religion in its kernel, and hold it firmly once and for all upon the stage of an inner triumph. Those who, on religious grounds, battle for the historic Jesus show that the essence of religion in its truth is hidden from them, and that they have not yet even learned to understand the meaning of "faith" in the religious sense.

To us faith is something purely inward, an immediate relation of the Ego to the Self, to the foundation of our being, to the ideal, instead of to the historical Christ, if one wishes to name Him so, in the unity of His spirit, which is at the same time also our own spirit. Should a further unfolding of religion in this sense be impossible, should modern man be able, as Liberalism holds, to find surety for his faith in God only through Jesus, and is he to believe in God all the more because Jesus believed in Him, then religion has fallen hopelessly into decay for ages to come, whose end no one can see. For Liberalism there is no other way of escape from sinking into abysmal depths than the return to orthodoxy, an event which,

it seems, is about to occur, or to accept the view, in some sense, of the followers and friends of the Ideal Christ.* This in substance is the interpretation which Drews offers of nature, man, and religion. It may be summarized as theosophical monism and semi-pantheistic mysticism, which look upon the deities of the ancient ethnic faiths, as well as upon the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, as symbolical personifications of the impersonal ideals of moral perfection created in man, through the presence of the eternal ethical divine essentials, idea and will, in the unity of God and Man. He follows Eduard von Hartmann, "the philosopher of the Unconscious," who on ethical grounds refused to recognize the Jesus of Modern Theology,† and grows enthusiastic over his monism, which he develops into a religious mysticism that reads, apart from the rationalistic implications in it and its terminology, like paragraphs from a profoundly devotional work, written in the vein of the doctrine of the "invisible Church" and the spiritual ascent of the "risen" Lord of the Synoptic accounts. This is the difference!

An interesting study offered by the varying effects of the Rationalistic, unevangelical view of the Life of Christ and the character of the Bible is found in the temperamental conclusions of Kant, Strauss, and Drews. Kant in later life devoted no time to the reading of the Scriptures. He looked upon them as

* Professor Dr. Arthur Drews, "Lebt Jesus?" *Berliner Religionsgespraech,* 1911.

† Professor Albert Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung.* Seite 350. Strassburg, 1906, und Tübingen, 1913.

being a collection of moral maxims, and regarded the Life of Jesus as a grand and wonderful ethical ideal. As long as the human reason retains the power to appreciate greatness and nobility, it will pay the tribute of the highest admiration and wonder to the lofty soul of Kant, who was a bright, shining sun, and could not obscure anything, but diffused light and warmth everywhere, says Jachmann, one of his friends and biographers.* The light of it will shine on eternally in the firmament of great minds. To the end of his days Kant revered the memory of his God-fearing, Christian, and pious mother, and spoke with tenderness of the good she had done him. But Jachmann states that it is not known whether he ever attended church in earlier years from a religious motive. Later on, in old age he seemed not to need outward forms to vivify his inner morality.† On one occasion, in a gathering of friends, he spoke of the vanity of the world, and said that it was his desire, in a life to come, to enter a future communion, composed not of mighty philosophical and scientific minds, but of just and noble, true and righteous spirits. At the same time Borowski, another intimate friend and biographer, records his heartfelt wish that Kant might have firmly and openly declared Jesus to be the sufficiently accredited Messiah and Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind, and that prayer to God might not have been an act of fetishism and humiliation to him, because of his careful avoidance of mysticism, whereby he

* Dr. Felix Gross, *Immanuel Kant—Sein Leben in Darstellungen von Zeitgenossen*, p. 131. Wien, 1912.

† P. 170.

failed to grant normal trustworthiness and authority to the religious emotions.*

Strauss, as compared with Kant and Drews, landed in materialism, as we have already seen, lost faith in the immortality of the human soul, and closed his life in utter despair concerning the future, both in relation to himself and to the world.

Drews, on the contrary, like his teacher, believes in the beginning and end of evil and misery, and many of his flights of faith, pinned to the Ideal Christ, are scarcely distinguishable from the triumphant hope of orthodox Christianity. But in agreement with Eduard von Hartmann, and every school of pantheistic monism, Drews denies the existence of moral evil in association with guilt and the divine demand for restitution. He has virtually destroyed the Jesus of Liberalism by proving the contradictory inadequacy of the concessions to higher criticism. And yet in doing so he has also demonstrated the insufficiency of the monistic mythological theory, and thus, through his own inadequate and unsustained idealizations, has rendered a negative tribute of great moment to the glory of the Jesus of dogma as the true Jesus of history, who is the Jesus of the Church. Even though found in the keenly assailed Gospel of St. John, the saying of Jesus: "Who of you convinceth me of sin?" bears in it an element of historicity of overwhelming force.† It reveals an order of ethical consciousness and spiritual holiness altogether exceptional

* Dr. Felix Gross, *Immanuel Kant—Sein Leben in Darstellungen von Zeitgenossen*, p. 90.

† John 8:46.

and most wonderful among the sons of men. Beyond the particularistic border-line of the Messianic hope of Israel and certain dim, unconscious prophecies in pagan classic literature, nothing even approaching it in purity, perfection, and sublimity can be found anywhere else in the whole known world.

Even Buddha, stung by the pangs of conscience, and pained by the misery of existence, withdrew from the presence of mankind to work out his own salvation as an initiatory example for others, and not as a single, all-sufficient act of vicarious and redemptive satisfaction. But Drews seems not to pay any attention to this crucial utterance of Jesus, upon which, in the main, as a self-revelation of the astounding moral perfection and peace of His own mind, the mind "which was also in Christ Jesus," His Messianic mission of world reconciliation rests.* Therefore Dunkmann's criticism of Drews in this connection is worthy of serious consideration. Dunkmann says that the methods and efforts possess great significance and command thoughtful attention, which postulate, in the outstart, the religio-historical connection, as alone setting the pace for the proper understanding of the origin of Primitive Christianity. These efforts are of quite recent date, and became known very nearly at the same time in countries of advanced Christian culture. The principal impetus to the present movement, in his view, was given by the various publications of the Englishman, John M. Robertson, after the first suggestion had been made in the closing decade of the nineteenth century by the Frenchmen, Hochart

* Philippians 2:5.

and Emil Burnouf. They were followed in America by R. W. Smith, in his work, *The Pre-Christian Jesus* (1906), and in Germany by Karl Vollers, the author of a book entitled *The World Religions in Their Historical Connection* (1907). A book of similar character, P. Jensen's *The Gilgamesch Epic in the Literature of the World,* and which appeared in 1906, wielded an important influence in the same direction.

These writings were studied by Arthur Drews and assembled in compact, comprehensive brevity in his *Die Christusmythe* (1910). The element of originality which Drews infuses into it fully agrees with his metaphysical theory, which constantly breaks through the investigation, and finally brings it to its culmination. At the same time, this background itself is not original, but has its source in Eduard von Hartmann's *Pessimism.* Hence Drews' book, *Die Christusmythe,* does not close the controversy concerning the historicity of Jesus, because it in turn requires further exposition, and has called forth another flood of polemical literature. Vollers devotes small attention to the problem. His work is a brief compendium of the universal comparative history of religions. Concerning the origin of Christianity, however, and the existence of Jesus, he expresses himself carefully and hesitatingly. He simply holds to the thesis that Christianity is a syncretic religion, and does not differentiate between the individual stages in its history.

Drews also depends almost entirely upon Robertson, and not upon Vollers. But Jensen's work disillusions any one who approaches it with religio-historical questions. In reality its content is not a " mythus," but an

"epos," and an epos from whose bosom not religious hero-legends arise, but also, and especially, legends which are absolutely neutral religiously, as is, for example, the Odysseus legend. Dunkmann says that in his estimation the whole weakness of the book lies in this indifference toward the actual mythus. A mythus can readily assume epic form, but in essence it remains a fragment of religion. However, Jensen, from the beginning to the end of his book, does not take any account of religion as an independent factor. One "epos" is sufficient for him. He deduces from it a hundred religions, including Christianity, and the whole myth-cycle of ancient Hellas. For the actual religio-historical investigation of Primitive Christianity, therefore, this book is valueless. The author writes as a layman concerning all theological questions, and frankly confesses that the theological literature which here comes into view has remained to him a *terra incognita.** And yet, even though Drews scarcely mentions Jensen's work, he in effect endorses Jensen's viewpoint when he says that Jesus "lives" in feeling and representation, or idea, and that He would "live" in this sense even if there had not been an historical Jesus. He would "live" as the artists live, as Homer, Sophocles, Luther, Shakespeare, and Goethe "live" in the memory of future generations, even though some unknown poet, or poets, wrote the Iliad and Odyssey, and Shakespeare, perhaps, was merely a "mask." In this sense, Drews continues, Zeus, Athene, Adonis, and Osiris also "live" and

* Karl Dunkmann, *Der historische Jesus, der mythologische Christus, und Jesus der Christ,* pp. 56, 57. Leipzig, 1911.

Jesus does not rise above the heathen gods. Jesus "lives" as Oedipus and Hamlet "live," and William Tell, in the poetic creations of Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Schiller, even though the characters themselves may never have existed in actual human form.* Idealists and myth-builders, like Drews, ought not to forget that Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Schiller received the tales they wrought into immortal verse from the folklore of an older day, and that it is an act of inexcusable assumption to declare them to be children of the imagination, without the least measure of historic background.

Ernst Troeltsch, who also accepts the modern world view, but at the same time, "with conviction and joy," acknowledges the unrelinquishable power of Christianity, carries his attack upon the traditional, Biblical doctrine of original sin into the very beginnings of cosmic life. He ascribes the authorship of the doctrine to the Apostle Paul, and says such teaching concerning sin demands courage enough to assert that the original perfection of the universe, before the poisoning of the world occurred, was disturbed by the sin of the protoplasts.† This strange confusion of thought arises from the unwillingness or the inability to differentiate between the irresponsible imperfections, if any such there be, in the world of things, and acts of moral rebellion and spiritual estrangement from God in the sphere of human personality, and the

* Arthur Drews, "Lebt Jesus?" pp. 17, 18. Berlin, März 12, 1911.

† Dr. Ernst Troeltsch, *Die Bedeutung der Geschichtlichkeit Jesu fuer den Glauben*, p. 21. Tübingen, 1911.

field of conscience. The ultimate key to the moral realm and to Christianity does not lie in the immeasurable periods of the cosmic processes, nor in the semi-religious mythical interpretation of the universe by early man.

In his admirable and signally able defence of the historic Christ, Canon Row says: "It must be observed that while the Christian mythologists had an endless variety of religious and moral problems, which required to be solved before the smallest progress could be made in forming the conception of a divine and human Christ, the Greek ones were entirely free from this embarrassment. They portrayed in their heroes the religion and morality of the times without attempting to create them anew. An Achilles, an Agamemnon, an Ajax, or an Ulysses, constitute as many dramatized representations of an heroic king. They are arrayed in the recognized morality. The poets found the groundwork of their creations in the living heroes of their day. Their Gods were those of their race and nation. They are invested with all the passions of humanity. They are simply heroes armed with superhuman power. Their wisdom and morality are no improvement on those which are ascribed to men. The whole uniformity of type which they present is preserved by closely adhering to the idealization of the times. A similar condition is observed throughout the whole range of fictitious literature. It pervades the whole of the mythical creations of the ancient world. All the labours of subsequent poets produced no improvement in the ideal conceptions of mythology. It is impossible to conceive two things more

unlike than the mythical creations of the ancient world, and the alleged mythology of the Gospels. We see at once that no amount of mythological development would ever have succeeded in creating out of these different characters the abstract conception of a Greek hero, in the same manner as the Evangelists are alleged to have framed out of the different mythical Christs that of a perfect man, and exhibited him in their Jesus." *

Here, then, we have before us, in plain view, some of the sources from which the progressives, the founders of Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church, drew so large a measure of their inspiration. In a number of aspects Loisy resembles Strauss. But the method of his criticism is liberally constructive, and his aim is idealistic, spiritualizing, and mystical, in obedience to the same law of unfolding, according to which, as some hold, the material universe, the race of man, social, political, and religious institutions, languages, literatures, mythologies, traditions, the symbolisms of miracle, and the sacred books of the nations, were built up, one after and into the other, cumulatively through unnumbered ages. It must be confessed that, apart from the question of its truth or untruth, the conception, the fearful outreach of it, quivers with immensity, taxes to the utmost and passes beyond the power and imagination of every serious man and woman. Commenting upon those who picture Loisy as a sort of Satan who has taken the destruction of the Bible as his mission, Paul Sabatier

* Rev. C. A. Row, *The Jesus of the Evangelists*, p. 207. Fifth Edition, 1891.

says: "Criticism has never destroyed anything. It is true that in unskilful hands it has occasionally seemed like a sort of inverted dogmatics, but it is precisely under Loisy's treatment that it is found to be constructive and edifying, that it gives us the history of religious endeavour throughout the ages, and shows us the way in which the rude and clumsy attempts have been the necessary prelude to, and preparation for, the noblest advances of the human conscience. There is a certain rationalist idealism which gladly accepts the chief conquests of humanity, but is unwilling to see how long a path was traversed before they could be attained. Criticism, on the contrary, shows us that we cannot understand the one without the other, that to know the fruit we must study the tree." *

* Paul Sabatier, *Modernism*, p. 22. Charles Scribner's Sons.

# X

## LOISY AND HIS CONCLUSIONS

LET us ask further about this man Loisy. Character, the inner reality one has gotten to be in some permanent form, after years of thought and discipline, wields a wonderful, a pervasive influence in shaping the individuality which impresses itself upon the work any man does or seeks to accomplish. Alfred Loisy is said in private life to be humble in spirit and above reproach. Intellectually he takes rank with the greatest thinkers of our time, and rises to the lofty eminence of rare originality in the field of historical and Biblical criticism. The product of his labour possesses the *colorit* of his thought-life and the illumination of his genius, as these unfolded in the environment of the Roman Catholic Church.

Harnack's book, *The Essence of Christianity* (Das Wesen des Christentums), was received with great satisfaction by learned Catholics in France. Loisy, however, believed that a better critical work, in the modern spirit, was possible, in harmony with Roman Catholic needs, and as the result of this conclusion he wrote his epoch-making volume, *The Gospel and the Church*. Loisy outlines the difference between Harnack and himself in the introduction. "Herr Harnack does not conceive Christianity as a seed, at first a plant in potentiality, then a real plant, identical

from the beginning of its evolution to the final limit and from the root to the summit of the stem, but as a fruit, ripe, or rather overripe, that must be peeled, to reach the incorruptible kernel; and Herr Harnack peels his fruit with such perseverance that the question arises if anything will remain at the end. This method of dismembering a subject does not belong to history, which is a science of observation of the living, not of dissection of the dead. Historical analysis notices and distinguishes, it does not destroy what it touches, nor think all movement digression, and all growth deformity. It is not by stripping Christianity leaf by leaf that the law of its life will be found. Such a dissection leads of necessity to a special theory, of philosophical value no doubt, but of little account from the positive standpoint of history. It is not for the theologian, unless in quite a personal exercise of his intelligence, and still less is it for the critic, to seize religion on the wing, dismember it, extract a something and declare it unique, by saying, "This is the essence of Christianity." Let us regard the Christian religion in its life, observing by what means it has lived from the beginning and is still sustained; let us note the principal features of this venerable existence, convinced that they lose nothing in reality or importance, because to-day they are presented to us under colours that are not those of a former time." *

There is a great deal of sophistry in this reasoning, as any one knows who is at all familiar with Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums.* Loisy here in a rather

* Loisy, *The Gospel and the Church,* p. 19. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

lame manner attempts to justify and defend every overgrowth of dogmatic ecclesiasticism. But whether one begins the movement forward from a life-germ in history to its ripest fruit in the most elaborate system of dogma and ritual, or beginning there, travels backward to a primordial, simple, and secret source, the conclusion in its effect upon faith is the same.

Loisy had undertaken the task of justifying faith in the Church among the educated classes, but on account of his radical views he had to resign the chair of Sacred Scripture in the Catholic Institute of Paris, through the influence and authority of Cardinal Richard. He made his submission to the Pope, and since then, since his excommunication from the Roman Church in 1908, he has lived in scholarly retirement. He is a savant of the highest order, but his method, his world view, his criticism, and conclusions are destructive, if admitted, not only to the traditional forms of government, dogma, and worship in the Roman Catholic Church, but also to the fundamental historical basis of the Christian faith, as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, which Evangelical Protestants share alike with Roman Catholics. Both as a scholar and an apologist he has been called revolutionary, often passing beyond his German masters. "But this after all is only the superficial activity of the man," says one who knows him. "Behind it lies a deep, humble, and religious nature, and one which you feel has received its most intimate quality from the Roman Church, and can never be at home elsewhere."

His position is in some degree an outgrowth of Ritschlianism. He has also been influenced by the

writings of Dr. Edward Caird, a disciple of Hegel. Loisy does not deny the sources of his inspiration. Kant, Lotze, and Ritschl were great men, and not bad men to live with by any means. But if one must follow in their wake, and accept their theory of knowledge *in toto,* one will, with the loss of the Jesus of history, also sacrifice the Christ of the Church. Faith must then follow the flare of a phantom.

Loisy rejects the tradition of the Virgin Birth, and asserts that the Resurrection of our Lord was an act of faith, rather than the result of a more sensible evidence. "It is in the nature of human affairs that the work, the genius, and the character of the greatest of mankind can only be appreciated at a certain distance, and when the actors themselves have disappeared. Christ, in so far as He belongs to human history, has not escaped this law. His grandeur was not perceived till after His death, and is it not a fact that it is more and more appreciated, as the centuries pass by, that the present is ameliorated by the influence of the Gospel, and the past illumined by all the experiences of humanity as it advances in age? It need only be added that this inevitable and legitimate idealization of Christ, arising spontaneously in the Christian consciousness, and not by the aid of rigorous observation and methodical reflection, must have affected, to a certain extent, the form of legendary development, although it is nothing but an expansion of faith, and an attempt, though an insufficient one, to set Jesus on the height that is His rightful place." *

The Christology of the fifth century he describes as

* *The Gospel and the Church,* p. 41. Charles Scribner's Sons.

speculative, inasmuch as it was an effort to define the mysterious and transcendent feeling Jesus possessed of His union with God. Faith in the immortal life of the Risen Lord grew out of the Messianic idea and hope. For this reason Loisy says that the significance of dogma is not absolute, but relative. Harnack, who lectures to large audiences of students in Berlin, as Loisy does in Paris, distinguishes between the personal and traditional elements in the teaching of Jesus. Loisy goes further, and declares that all of it is traditional. He reduces the element which cannot be traced to tradition to the Messianic idea. As an historian he limits the divine Sonship to the belief Jesus had that He was the Messiah. The essence of Christianity, he says, is the grand hope—" la grande espérance "—which Jesus proclaimed to and breathed into the world, which was drawn from Judaism, and glorified, uplifted, and immortalized in the Risen Lord.

Loisy denies that Jesus foresaw the future of the Church. All He said to His disciples was to admonish them to live in, and unto, the kingdom of God. The perspective of the kingdom has been widened and modified, that of its definite arrival has receded, but the aim of the Gospel has remained the aim of the Church. The actual form of the hope, he says, as Jesus taught and conceived it, had already changed within the lifetime of some of the Apostles. It would have been without point or purpose, he teaches, for Jesus to reveal the future of the Church to His disciples, had it even been possible. Loisy holds that the Christian society of the first centuries consisted of autonomous churches. Later on, and perhaps grad-

ually, out of the battle with the Gnostic heresies, the idea of a central seat of authority came forth. He says that the Gospel is not absolute in form, nor valid for all times, places, souls, and circumstances. The only element absolute in it is its life, its soul, that life of the Gospel communicated to men through the Risen Christ. Hence he proclaims and calls for a liberalization of the Catholic Church, in line with the dominant idea and principle of progress, to admit all branches of Christianity, the Pope to remain the Father of the faithful, and the Head of the Churches. Notice the use of the plural! This action will never again, he prophesies, take the form it had in the Middle Ages, but this power, he contends, will always be needed for the preservation of the Church, and for the preservation of the Gospel in the Church.

One of the Cardinals is reported to have said that the Church would be revolutionized should Loisy's ideas prevail. But, if truth be told, the revolution would extend further. It would involve all Christendom. They are trying to unravel the texture of the canvas, and to discover how many coats of pigment were spread upon it, before the colossal picture of patristic, conciliar, and medieval Christianity, the Renaissance, and the Protestant Reformation, with its cloud of confessional witnesses, crept out over, and stood forth from, the rude and simple background. In a conversation about Harnack and Loisy, a Catholic priest said to the writer: "It would be an irreparable loss to the whole world should the Jesus of history and of the Church be taken away." Sharing his con-

viction, we said in return: ' Much as they are annoyed, to say the least, by the memory of the Reformation, Catholics ought never to forget that the Reformers of the sixteenth century were sound in their faith in the fundamentals of Christian truth, as set forth in the Word of God, and at no time questioned the binding authority and saving efficiency of the Creed of Apostolic Christianity. Therefore, whatever other differences exist, however pronounced some of them are, and at present irreconcilable, the ambassadors of Christ and His kingdom ought always first and above all else to proclaim, in objective and subjective revelation, the Gospel of the Son of God, yesterday, to-day, and forever the same.'

Let us quote again from Loisy, to show that he is fully aware of this unity in the fundamentals of the Christian faith. He says: " Great admirer of Luther as he is, Herr Harnack holds the Protestant Reformation to have been incomplete. In matters of dogma there is a crowd of problems that Luther did not know, much less was able to solve. He was in consequence unable to separate the kernel from the husk. He not only admits in the Gospel the ancient dogmas of the Trinity and the two natures in Christ . . . he constructed new dogmas; but generally speaking, did not know how to draw a clear distinction between dogma and the Gospel. . . . The inevitable consequence was, that intellectualism was not destroyed, but formed a new scholastic dogma, considered essential to salvation, so that there remained two classes of Christians, those who understood the doctrine and those who accepted it from those who understood and

thus continued spiritually minors." * Loisy then comments as follows: "In this respect, Protestantism threatens to become an inferior type of Catholicism. Let the Evangelical Churches beware of becoming Catholicized! If they would remain truly evangelical, they must have no orthodoxy." In *Il Santo,* Benedetto tells the Pontiff that the spirit of immobility is the fourth spirit of evil which has taken possession of the Church. "Catholics, both ecclesiastics and laymen, who are dominated by the spirit of immobility believe they are pleasing God, as did those zealous Jews who caused Christ to be crucified. All the clericals, Your Holiness, all the religious men even, who to-day oppose progressive Catholicism, would, in all good faith, have caused Christ to be crucified in Moses' name. They are worshippers of the past. They wish everything to remain unalterable in the Church, even to the style of the pontifical language, even to the great fans of peacock's feathers which offend Your Holiness' priestly heart, even to those senseless traditions which forbid a cardinal to go out on foot, and make it scandalous for him to visit the poor in their houses." †

It is plain to be seen that Loisy would, if he could, extend the attack upon fundamental historic Christian faith, upon the so-called immobility of Trinitarian Christianity, throughout the world. The difference between the excommunication of Luther and that of Loisy is as great almost as between day and night.

* *The Gospel and the Church,* pp. 186, 187. Charles Scribner's Sons.

† A. Fogazzaro, *The Saint,* pp. 340, 341. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century did not oppose the objective apprehension of the saving facts revealed in the Gospel, but made an attack upon the channels through which the means of grace were applied. The elemental power of Protestantism is not to be traced to the field of Theology and Christology, essentially, but to Anthropology, and the subjective side of the realm of Soteriology.* At the same time the Reformation did not neglect the historic side of Christianity, that is to say, theological teaching, but really deepened the apprehension of the fundamental objective truth of Christianity. Evangelical Protestantism places above all confessional differences the theanthropic principle of Christianity, the revelation made by God in Jesus Christ, the mediatorial and only Saviour from sin, as set forth and imparted to consciousness through the medium of its confessional symbols.

* Hagenbach, "Zur Beantwortung der Frage über das Princip des Protestantismus," *Theologische Studien u. Kritiken,* pp. 48, 49 (1854).

## XI

# RABBINIC LORE AND THE HISTORICITY OF JESUS

IN unexpected confirmation of, and almost overwhelming harmony with, this advanced scientific and at the same time Biblico-historical position of Evangelical Protestantism, a remarkable contribution to apologetic literature, in defence of the historicity of Jesus, recently came from Rabbinic sources, from the pen of Professor Dr. Gottlieb Klein, a Jewish rabbi in Stockholm, in Sweden. This work, entitled *Is Jesus an Historical Personality?* was called forth in 1910 by the great controversy in Germany, to which allusion has already been made, concerning the credibility of the Synoptic accounts of the existence and mission of Jesus.* Dr. Klein mentions, but does not answer, Drews in his introduction, because his object is to furnish evidence from a field of knowledge accessible to him, that the religious movement which gave birth to Christianity rests upon an historic person, and that that person could have been none other than Jesus of Nazareth. However, the validity of this conclusion can alone be sustained by placing before the mind an epitome of the unfolding of Israel's religion from the immemorial beginnings, which are

* Professor Dr. Gottlieb Klein, *Ist Jesus eine historische Persönlichkeit?* Verlag von Paul Siebeck, Tübingen, 1910.

shrouded in darkness, to the advent of Jesus. The definitely historical development includes the Mosaic economy, the giving of the Law, the rise of Prophecy, the defence of ethical Monotheism, the declaration of the unity and holiness of God, and the unity of mankind; the conflict with polytheism and heathen degradation; the Jahvidic mission of Israel, as "the servant of God," to establish a universal theocracy; the apostolate of Israel to the Gentiles, the founding of the kingdom of God, and the conversion of the whole doomed earth into a house of prayer for all nations.

Through Israel every nation is to be blessed. These noble aspirations and this sublime destiny stand out in shining contrast with the state of things within the borders of Judea at the time of the Advent of Jesus. Torn by partisan hatred, oppressed and enslaved by the Romans, its whole national existence had become problematical.* Then, at the same time, there awoke with elemental power the aspiration after a deliverer and an emancipator. The author of the pamphlet, Dr. Klein, does not say anything about the pseudo-messiahs and the treatment they received from the Roman procurators. But before he takes up his subject proper, he cites a saying of Hillel's, which he associates with the death of John the Baptist, and which throws light upon the spirit that actuated Hillel. In the Gospel of Matthew, 14: 10-12 and parallel passages, one reads: Herod had John beheaded in prison, "and his head was brought on a charger and

* Dr. Gottlieb Klein, *Ist Jesus eine historische Persönlichkeit?* p. 15.

given to the damsel, and she brought it to her mother. And his disciples came and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus." The disciples accordingly buried the headless body, for the mother received the head. What was done with the latter? Jewish tradition completes the account.* Hillel saw this skull floating on the water, and said to it: "Because thou hast baptized, thou hast been drowned, and the end of those who drowned thee will be that they will be drowned." That is to say, the criminals would be punished. Commenting upon this passage, Josephus gives the following account of the death of John: "His death, however, according to the conviction of the Jews, caused God in His wrath to sacrifice Herod's army." † These three independent accounts narrate the end of John the Baptist, and the effect of his death. Any one who is trained in the science of history must admit that we here deal with facts which rest upon documentary evidence.

According to the latest "investigations" we are told that Jesus never existed and that the account about Him in the New Testament is an invention. Then the further conclusion follows: If Jesus never existed we must also doubt the existence of John, or forgive Hillel and Josephus their lie. The passage cited from Hillel, however, has another bearing in the interpretation. It proves to us that Hillel sympathized with John the Baptist, the preacher of repentance. We will not wonder at this when we consider the

* P. Abroth 2, 6. Comp. his "Miscelle" in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Band II, Seite 345.

† Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii, 5, 2.

depth of Hillel's thought, the fervency of his spirit, his unfeigned love for man, and the agencies he set to work against the mere letter of the Scriptures.* Though he followed the footsteps of Hillel, Jesus at the same time went beyond him.

Dr. Klein, stepping in *in medias res,* as he says, points to the great speech against Pharisaism. This speech is principally a protest against the scribes and their minutely formulated priestly statutes. "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. And whoso shall swear by the temple sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not leave the other undone. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the out-

* Abr. Geiger, *Das Judentum und seine Geschichte.* Erste Abteilung, s. 99 ff., über "Hillel."

side of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and the platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." *

We seem actually to see the speaker within the temple bounds. Emerging from the outer court, He casts His eyes in every direction, and nothing escapes His glance. He first sees the temple as a whole, and next the gold, visible from the outside, which adorns it. He moves forward a few steps and catches sight of the altar and the offerings upon it. Entering the interior of the temple, He sees the poor people bring the gifts prescribed by the Scriptures to the priests, who, to earn the divine reward, purify chalice and charger, "because the purification of the vessels was of more value to them than human life." One reads in the Talmud of the unbending sternness with which the laws relating to clean and unclean things were observed.†

A fact of much greater significance, one which gives to our speech in particular the importance of an historical document of the first rank, is that the scathing invective, Dr. Klein continues, can alone be understood in connection with the time-period in which Jesus lived. With every word Jesus bears overwhelm-

* Matthew 23: 16-28.

† Dr. Gottlieb Klein, *Der Aelteste Christliche Katechismus,* S. 331.

ing witness to the truth. He wages battle against the priest-religion, the hierarchy, against priestly holiness, by which the Pharisees sold the people into subjugation, to be preyed upon and despoiled by the priests. Jesus thus presses His finger upon the greatest of all sores, the despiritualization of religion by priestly statutes and commandments, with the endorsement of the Pharisees.

Dr. Klein finds additional evidence for the historicity of Jesus in the controversy concerning the resurrection. In the Gospel of Matthew it is said that when the Sadducees, pretending to follow Moses, sought to entangle Jesus by asking Him to whom the wife of seven brothers who had died in succession would belong in the resurrection, He answered that in the life to come there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage, and that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. In the Talmudic literature such conversations between Sadducees and Pharisees frequently appear. Through irritating and subtle questions the opulent and happy priests sought to lead the Pharisees into absurdity, and the dispute recorded in the Gospel fits so well into the frame of the history of Jewish parties that it can be regarded as a counterpart of the conversations narrated in the Talmud. To obviate misunderstanding, the author cites the following evidence. Concerning the relation of the parties to each other, Josephus says: " What I would now explain is this, that the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the laws of Moses; and for that reason it is that the Sadducees

reject them, and say that we are to esteem those observances to be obligatory which are in the written word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers." *

Moreover, the Gospels show that the Sadducees differed from the Pharisees in their view concerning the resurrection. They were defeated in the argument with Jesus, because He cited Exodus 3:6, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," and added the interpretation: "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living." With this Scriptural citation He silenced His Sadducaic opponents. To us this summary dispatch of the Sadducees appears to be unexplainable. How does it happen, we ask, that Jesus cited just this passage from the Pentateuch, which needs further elucidation, when other plainer passages stood at his command? Dr. Klein mentions Isaiah 26:19, "Thy dead shall live, (and) my dead shall arise," or Daniel 12:2, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The doctrine of the resurrection could not be more plainly stated. Jewish tradition alone gives the correct solution of this problem. From Josephus we learn that the Sadducees claimed obedience only for the written law. In agreement with this testimony of the great Jewish historian, the Talmud says that the Sadducees regarded the Pentateuch, the Thora, alone as being canonical. Only with the help of this evidence is it possible to explain the fact that Jesus drew His citation from the Pen-

* Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, xiii, 10, 6.

tateuch, and not from the Prophets. Had He appealed to the Prophets, the Sadducees would have rejected His authority. Jesus saw that the Sadducees would have to be defeated with their own weapons. Any one, says Dr. Klein, who has the sense of reality does not need to be told that in this action we possess a living, historical picture from New Testament times. One recorded incident like this is sufficient to convince us of the historicity of Jesus.

The narrative of the ears of corn plucked by the disciples on the Sabbath day (Mark 2:23-28) is another occurrence which Dr. Klein mentions to prove the reality of Jesus. Through Jewish tradition the incident becomes clearer to the understanding. In Jerusalem there existed a pious society called The Sacred Congregation. Jewish-Christians also belonged to it (Acts 9:13; 26:10), because for decades after the death of Jesus trade and social relations existed between Jews and Jewish-Christians. Therefore it had to be shown that for the support of life the law of the Sabbath might be abrogated. Simon ben Menasja proves this by the injunction (Exodus 31:14): "Ye shall keep the Sabbath, therefore, for it is holy unto you." The superfluous "unto you" is meant to emphasize the doctrine that the Sabbath is for you, and that you are not for the Sabbath. It is the same answer that Jesus gave to the Pharisees, but the method of demonstration is different. Simon proves his conclusion from the superfluous "unto you." Jesus establishes the same principle by pointing to David, who in his hunger ate the showbread, which, as a layman, he was not permitted to do. The

Midrash also offers the following parallel: "When no other bread than showbread was found there, David said to the priest, Give us of it that we may not die of hunger, for the duty to preserve life takes precedence over the commandment to keep the Sabbath." * He cites these instances in order to prove the historicity of the accounts concerning the prophetical activity of Jesus. He says that if Jesus had been a *cultheros* we would possess entirely different narrations regarding His movements. As it is, one can by direct scientific evidence prove by the Gospels that they originated from a primal fountain which extends backward to the first disciples of Jesus, and that they faithfully hand down what they received from the Master.

The answer He gave to the Canaanitish woman (Matthew 15:23-26), His admonition to His disciples not to consort with the heathen, nor to enter the Samaritan cities, but to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; His apocalyptic vision of the end of the world (Matthew 24:20); the counsel given to the leper after he had been healed by Jesus, to show himself to the priest (Matthew 8:4), into whose hands the written authority of the Scriptures placed him, that the priest might pronounce official approval of the cure, constitute a thoroughly Jewish background, over which hangs the odour of Palestinian soil, where we see Jesus in the frame of His age, and upon which only the most unbridled fantasy could convert the historical Jesus into a mythical composite, a phantom, and an idealistic fiction.

* Jalkut Samuel 130. See Dr. Klein, *Ist Jesus eine historische Persönlichkeit?* p. 24.

Dr. Klein holds that Jesus, in His conversation with His disciples, as narrated by Mark (Mark 2), made the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah His point of departure. This chapter especially was epochal in His mission. We know this from the Gospel of Luke (Luke 4: 16-20): "And he came to Nazareth where he had been brought up: and he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Isaiah. And he opened the book, and found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to proclaim the gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, the recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those that are bound, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down: and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened upon him. And He began to say unto them, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears. And all bare Him witness, and wondered at the words of grace which proceeded out of His mouth."

Dr. Klein declares this to have been a moment of decisive initiative, the most important in the life of Christ. One can, however, understand the passage in St. Mark even better by a study of the context in Isaiah, which shows that Jesus applied the prophet's acclamation of joy to himself, as against the Pharisees and the disciples of John the Baptist. Wedding guests do not fast as long as they have the bridegroom with them. The prophet gives him the picture. The say-

ing of Jesus (Mark 2:21), that no man sews a piece of undressed cloth on an old garment, made plain to his disciples the difference between himself and John the Baptist. John sought to purify the old. Jesus came to make all things new. His mind dwelt upon the words of the prophet: "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation." (Isaiah 61:10.) The garments are new, and made from new cloth. The new robe must not be spoiled to patch the old garment. The old must pass away to make room for the new. Conscious that He was the Messiah, as we see without equivocation in the fourth chapter of Luke, He could neither think nor speak otherwise. In the Messianic Age, Jewish tradition says, the ceremonial law will be abrogated.* One can readily see, without any further proof, our earnest and truth-loving rabbi concludes, that we deal here with history, and not with poetic fiction.†

Dr. Klein calls the Lord's Prayer the most sacred legacy which the disciples received from Jesus. The science of critical research in the history of religion has thus far not attempted to produce anything comparable to this prayer. It is as deeply personal as anything we have from Jesus. If ever anything sprang forth from the Messianic consciousness, it is just this prayer. All the hopes and desires which inspired the God-filled heart of Jesus are here compacted into unity. It is an upward cry of the soul to

* Nidda 61 a; Ab. s. 3 a. M. Moed Katon, iii, 9, applies Isaiah 25:8 to the Messianic Age. Dr. Klein, *Ist Jesus eine historische Persönlichkeit?* p. 32.

† Dr. Klein, *Ist Jesus eine historische Persönlichkeit?* p. 32, 1910.

God to grant what is most needed by the world at every moment. This prayer reflects the historic atmosphere of the time.

According to Matthew the Lord's Prayer consists of seven petitions. Also according to Jewish prescription a prayer is to consist of seven eulogies. Besides, it is to have three parts: the Schebach, or opening hymnus; the Tefilla, or group of personal petitions, and the Hodaja, or doxology. This order is found in the Lord's Prayer. Furthermore, a prayer is to be offered in the plural form, and the Lord's Prayer possesses also this characteristic. On the other hand, naturally, the content is more important than the form.

In a passing allusion to the first two petitions of the Lord's Prayer, Dr. Klein says that through the testimony of the book of Daniel the Jews looked forward to a resurrection of the dead at the advent of the Messiah. The Sadducees, however, did not accept this doctrine. Their attitude can be explained only by the historic conditions of the time. The Jews with one accord made war against the Syrians to prepare Messiah's way. They held Antiochus Epiphanes to be the Jewish anti-Christ. They believed Judas Maccabæus, the lion-hearted scion of the Hasmonean house, to be the promised Messiah. But the intoxication of victory soon spent itself, and the hopes of the people were dashed to earth. Messiah had not come. Signs and wonders had not appeared. The graves did not open, and the dead continued to sleep their eternal sleep. The Hasmonean princes, steeped in worldliness, called back the Sadducees, the old nobility. Antagonism arose against the usurper upon the

Davidian throne, and appeal again was made to the prophecy of Daniel that in Messiah's Day the dead would come to life. Dr. Klein holds that the Sadducees denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead not upon dogmatic or speculative grounds, but for political reasons. In his estimation this is the source of the Sadducean unbelief.* The Pharisees, on the other hand, maintained the view that the resurrection of the dead would be associated with the coming of the kingdom of God. The one would thus bear witness to the other. Through the resurrection, as foretold by Ezekiel (Ezekiel 37: 14) the name of God will be hallowed throughout the world. Literally the passage in *Seder Elijahu rabba* reads as follows: "The Blessed One, all praise to Him, permits the dead to arise in this world, in order that His great name may be glorified."

Faith in the resurrection also held a central place in the conviction and teaching of Jesus. The Sadducees vexed Him with test questions growing out of their denial. (Matthew 22: 23.) He answered: "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." (Matthew 22: 31, 32.) The resurrection of the dead was to be one of the most convincing evidences of His title to the Messiahship. When the disciples of John the Baptist asked Jesus: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" Jesus answered: "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, *the dead are raised up,* and the poor have the Gospel

* Dr. Gottlieb Klein, *Is Jesus an Historical Personality?* p. 37.

preached to them." (Matthew 11:4, 5.) Based upon this conviction the fourth Evangelist declares: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." And again he says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." (John 5:21, 25.)

The resurrections recorded in the New Testament had no other purpose than to establish the dawn of the Messianic Age. Moreover, the life of Paul presents additional proof that faith in the resurrection was an integral element of Messiah's advent, and gave integrity to the Messianic time, because Paul never would have been converted to Christianity, and never would have become an Apostle, had he not been convinced of the resurrection of Jesus. (I Corinthians 15:22.)

The petitions: Hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Dr. Klein continues, can only be explained by the Messianic mood and consciousness, for the name of God is first glorified by the resurrection of the dead, and then the kingdom follows. The relation which the *Ani-we-Hu,* the hidden name of God, the *Schem hammephorasch,* to be revealed, according to Jewish tradition, in the Messianic Age to every one, bears to the deepest mystery of religion is most profound, the *unio mystica,* the call and requirement to enter into union with God, the mystery which Jesus revealed to the world, which forms the golden thread of the Gospel of St. John, and which, in keeping with *Mishna Sanhedrin* vii, 5: "He who blasphemes God

is only then guilty when he utters the hidden name of God," led the Pharisees to prefer the charge of sacrilege against Jesus. All the circumstances indicate that at His trial Jesus must have used the words of the Hebrew text in his answer to the high priest, *Ani-we-Hu.* (Mark 14: 16.) The high priest "rent his clothes," as prescribed in the *Mishna,* and said: "What need we any further witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy! What think ye?" Therefore Jesus must have pronounced the *Ani-we-Hu,* the hidden name of God.

Gamaliel is an historical personage. He was the teacher of the Apostle Paul. As the successor of Hillel, he laboured in the same free spirit. Under his administration a general charity union was organized for the benefit of both Jews and Gentiles, to care for all alike, to visit the sick also among the heathen, to bury the dead, to preach funeral discourses, to comfort the sorrowing, and to clothe the naked, for the sake of peace. Gamaliel's declaration (Acts 5: 38, 39) has an interesting parallel in old Jewish literature. In *Pirke Abot* iv, 14, it is said: "Every union which is formed for a heavenly purpose will abide." No less historical, as can also be proved from Jewish sources, is the Apostolical Council, whose decree welcomed the Gentile world, without submission to the yoke of the Mosaic law (Acts 15: 10), to the fellowship of Jesus.

The unprejudiced and historically scientific tribute paid by the scholarly and pious Swedish rabbi to the genuineness, authenticity, and trustworthiness of the four Gospels is not only very remarkable in itself,

but also of inestimable value to Christians everywhere. In conclusion Dr. Klein says that the result of over thirty years of research, which he has devoted to the study of the New Testament period, proves the teaching of Jesus, or in the words of Harnack the "first Gospel," to be the clearest, the most concise, the most strikingly personal doctrine which has come down to us from antiquity. We see and hear in it a definite Personality, stamped with the traits of the time, and alone explainable by the conditions of the age. The search is in vain elsewhere for the ethical monotheism which Jesus preached in harmony with the Messianic hope and in the Spirit of the prophets of Israel. In vain will one seek elsewhere for the Jewish world of thought in which Jesus moved. Hence the fact rests upon a firm foundation, which no philosophy can destroy, that Jesus of Nazareth is an historical Personality.*

Constantine Tischendorf says: "With the Person of Jesus, Christianity stands or falls. To divest this Person of His greatness, and still to try to preserve the Christian faith and the Christian Church, is a useless undertaking and rests upon an empty delusion. The Life of Jesus presents itself to Christian research and wisdom as the greatest, the absolutely decisive question for the existence or non-existence of the Church." † The unanswerable dilemma with which the noble and gifted Ullmann confronted Strauss and

* Dr. Gottlieb Klein, *Ist Jesus eine historische Persönlichkeit?* pp. 37, 38, 43.

† Tischendorf, *Wann Wurden Unsere Evangelien Verfasst?* Leipzig, 1865.

his Mythical Theory challenges the Modernists and all their sympathizers to-day: "Either the Christ was the invention of the Apostolic Church, or the Apostolic Church was founded by Christ."

In his *Autobiography*, Dr. Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher says that when he was a student in Germany at the close of the eighteenth century the celebrated Bible scholar and famous savant, Johann Friedrich von Meyer, expressed the conviction to him that the textual problem will not affect the spiritual assurance, the faith, and hope of Christendom. "Christus bleibt doch der Er ist!" The Christ will not be changed thereby! The traditions concerning His deity, His mediatorship, and Saviourhood now lie safely embedded, treasured, and authenticated in the current of world history, and in millions of souls redeemed and sanctified by Him, and translated into the Heavenly Life.

ERRATA

Page 9, In the preface, instead of Voight read Voigt.

Page 112, In the marginal note, read: Bœhringer.

Page 122, In the fourth line from the top, read: Reformed confession of faith.

Page 171, Third line from the bottom, read: Sulzbach.

Page 201, In the ninth line from the bottom, read; ecclesiastical.

Page 279, First line at top, read: προφορικὸς

Page 279, Line six from below, read: That a creature of Godlike essence, a spiritual, personal, self-conscious being, should appear in creation, that God's non-Ego is again itself Ego, is absolutely incomprehensible, is the absolute miracle.

Page 312, Line eleven, instead of doomed, read domed—the whole domed earth, i. e. covered as with a dome.

Page 78, Line nine, work-righteousness.

# INDEX


A

Abbey, Cistercian, 213
Absolute, The, 224, 263
Absolutism, Papal, 182
*Acta Pilati*, 160
Acts, 28, 36, 37
Aeda, 191
Agape, 102, 114
Albert, Prince of Prussia, 188
Albi, Archbishop of, 216
Albigenses, 109
Alexandria, School of, 260
Altar, Sacrament of, 209, 245
Ambrosius, Saint, 105
Ananias, 26
Anicetus, 24
Ani-we-Hu, 324, 325
*Annales Ecclesiastici*, 11
Ansgar, Saint, 111
Anthropology, 60, 63
Antinomy, The first, 280
Antioch, Church of, 205, 206
Antiochus Epiphanes, 322
Antistes, 90
Apocrypha, 158
Apocryphal Gospel, 46
Apocryphal Literature, 159
Apollos, 207
Apologetics, 30, 266
Apostle Paul, 201, 206, 324, 325
Apostle Peter, 205
Apostles, 238
Apostolate, Saint Paul's, 205
Apostolical Council, 325
Apostolic Church, 327
Apostolic Constitutions, 201
Apostolic Times, 33, 46, 80, 196
Aquinas, Thomas, 167
Arabia, 205
Arneys, Antoine, 134
Asceticism, 166, 227
Asia, 34
Athenagoras, Epistles of, 159
Atonement, 71, 120, 232
Augsburg Confession, 71, 176
Augustine, Saint, 231, 250
Augustine, Theology of, 247
Augustinian Monks, 166
Authority, Apostolic, 201
Authority, Clerical, 167
Authority, Ecclesiastical, 200
Authority, *Jure divino*, 167

B

Babel, 77
Babylon the Great, 197
Bacon, Benjamin W., 167
Baliol College, 217
Bandini, Cardinal, 21
Baptism, 25, 194
Baptism, Sacrament of, 193
Barnabas, 29, 206
Barnabas, Epistle of, 160
Baronius, 11
Barry, Dr. William, 50, 52
Basil, 51
Basilides, 159
Batiffol, 38, 39, 215, 236, 237, 239
Baur, Bruno, 255
Baur, Dr. F. C., 26, 28, 31, 33, 123
Becket, Thomas à, 213
Believers, Priesthood of, 243
Bernard, Saint, 109
Bible, 49, 292
Bible, Historicity of, 211
Bible Reading, 171
Bithynia, 36
Boehringer, 250
Borowski, 293
Bossuet, Bishop, 49
Boston, 215

Brahe, Tycho, 22
Bucer, Martin, 188
Buddha, 288, 295
Bullinger, Heinrich, 133
Bunsen, Chevalier, 202
Burnouf, Emil, 296

C

Caird, Edward, 217, 221, 223, 232, 305
Calixtus I., 30
Calvin, John, 61, 72, 96, 104, 132, 136, 141, 166, 188, 203, 204, 205, 249
Calvinistic System, 204
Canon, Muratorian, 158
Carlyle, Thomas, 222
Carthage, Seventh Council of, 248
Catechism, Heidelberg, 61, 71, 92, 97, 118
Catholics, 44
Catholicism, 50, 182, 309
*Causa Apprehendens*, 73
*Causa Efficiens*, 195
*Causa Meritoria*, 73
Celibacy, 10
Celsus, 159, 260
Cephas, 207
Charles V, 177, 178
Christ, 202, 226, 268, 276, 306
  Authority of, 208
  Deity of, 139, 150
  Doctrine of, 208
  Impartation of, 197
  Person of, 130, 132, 142, 227
  Sinlessness of, 278
  The indwelling, 114, 242
  Vicarious death of, 71
Christian Doctrine, 45
Christianity, 24, 40, 205, 208, 218, 219, 220, 223, 225, 230, 231, 306, 307, 311, 326
  Catholic, 39, 72
  Latin, 24
  Medieval, 208
  Pauline, Petrine, 33
  Primitive, 295, 297
  Realization of, 86
Christianity, Theanthropic Principle of, 310
  Trinitarian, 309
Christian Religion, 100
Christology, 63
Christology, Mythological, 278
Christology of the Fifth Century, 305
Christ-Thought, 270
Church, The, 44, 191, 197, 198, 242, 245
  Anglican, 186
  Apostolic, 40
  Authority of, 46
  Christian, 34, 197
  Corner-stone of, 26
  Early, 33, 206, 236
  Evangelical, 201, 204, 309
  Gentile, 34
  Government of, 32, 199, 200, 205
  Greek Catholic, 245
  Head of, 206
  Historic, 207
  Invisible, 49, 50, 191, 194, 199, 200, 201, 240, 292
  Jesus of, 294
  Jewish, 34
  Latin, 161
  Lutheran, 61, 73, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190
  Medieval, 190, 199, 234
  of Rome, 214
  Organism of, 197
  Polarity of, 198
  Primitive, 190
  Protestant, 202
  Reformed, 61, 118, 185, 186, 187, 190, 246
  Roman Catholic, 48, 76, 146, 187, 197, 211, 217, 246, 259, 300, 302, 304, 307
  Soul of, 204
  Twofold Character of, 193
  Universal, 206
  Visible, 50, 200, 201, 240
Civil Power, 201
Clement XI, Pope, 179
Clement, Epistle of, 29
Clement of Alexandria, 158
*Coetus Sanctorum*, 194, 195

Cognition, Theory of, 208
Colenso, 51
Commission, Saint Paul's, 205
Communion, Visible, 196
Conception, Miraculous, 100
*Confessio Gallicana,* 204
Confession, Augsburg, 71, 176
Auricular, 182
Basel, 72
*Catechismus Romanus,* 78
Form of Concord, 74
Helvetic, 71, 72, 186
Confessions, 200
Reformed, 250
Conscience, Ground of, 54
Ownership of, 71
Consciousness, Christian, 45
Conti, Family of, 91
Palace of, 11
Conversion, 196, 197
Copernican Theory, 21
Corinth, 35
Council, Ecumenical, 13, 170, 229
Lateran, 174
Nicæa, 184
Trent, 49, 174, 178, 259
Vatican, 49, 259
Creed, Apostles', 183, 187
Criticism, 266
Criticism, Literary, 40, 210, 220, 259
Cultus, 200
Curia, 170, 212
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 247, 248
Cyril of Alexandria, 70

D

Dalberg, von, Karl Theodore, 169
Damascus, 205
Darwin, Charles, 51
Decrees, Tridentine, 247
Democracy, Christian, 210
Desjardins, M., 214
Development, Historical, 47, 53
Dialectic, Divine, 226
Diaspora, 34, 35
Didachè, 29, 115
Diognet, 29
Dionysius, of Corinth, 159
Discipline, Montanistic, 249
Dispersion, 244
Doctrine, Christian, 45
Evangelical, 201
Evolution of, 224
Medieval Catholic, 130
Reformation, 204
Dogma, Definition of, 251
Dominicans, 213
Drews, Dr. Arthur, 255, 260, 285, 287, 288, 292, 294, 295, 296, 298, 311
Dualism, Greek, 224
Duchesne, Dr. Louis, 234
Dunkmann, Dr. Karl, 295, 297

E

Early Church, 33, 206, 236
Easter, 24
Ebrard Dr. J. H. A., 192, 197
Ebrard's *Christliche Dogmatik,* 194
Ecclesia, 191, 233
Ecclesiasticism, 200, 202
Edmund, Saint, Brotherhood of, 214
Eighteenth Century Enlightenment, 218
Empire, Civil Power, 127
Engert, Dr. Thaddeus, 28, 31, 33
Ephesians, 37
Ephesus, 37
Synod of, 70
Episcopacy, in Germany, 203
Epos, 297
Erasmus, 175, 176, 210
Erigena, John Scotus, 103
Error, 198, 199
Two forms of, 196
Eucharist, 209, 234, 245, 249
Eucharistic Feast, 116
Eucken, Rudolph, 217
Eusebius, 31
Evil, Eradication of, 225
Moral, or Sin, 232, 294
Problem of, 224
Evolution, 248, 251, 254, 256, 276, 300, 304

Evolution, Creative, 241
Dogmatic, 253
Organic, 221
Theory of, 48, 208
Excommunication, 215
Exodus, 192

F

Faith, 53, 73, 222, 291, 304, 306
Act of, 199
Articles of, 186
Christocentric, 261
Conception of, 130
Evangelical, 177, 204
Evangelical conception of, 76
Individual, 196
Justification by, 53, 68, 73, 153, 201, 238
Lutheran view of, 156
Norm of, 208
Pauline, 205
Primitive form of, 183
Static expression of, 182
Symbols of, 223
True Catholic, 65
Fathers, Greek and Latin, 181
Fichte, 219
Fogazzaro, Antonio, 214, 309
Frauenstädt, J., 272, 273, 275, 277, 279, 282
Freiburg, University of, 170
Froude, James Anthony, 52, 221, 222

G

Gabler, Dr. G. A., 280, 281, 282
Galatians, Epistle to, 205
Galileo, 21
Gamaliel, 325
Gaussen, Etienne, 186
Geneva, Republic of, 132
Gentiles, The Apostle to, 206
Gerome, Saint, Society of, 211
"Gesta Innocentii," 94
Gilgamesch Epic, The, 296
Glennon, Dr. J. G., 257
Gnosis, 33
Gnosticism, 25
Gnostics, 30, 31
God, Consciousness of, 217
Kingdom of, 231
God-Man, 273
Goebel, Max, 61, 185, 188, 189, 190
Goeschel, C. F., 261, 262, 263, 265, 276
Goethe, von, Johann Wolfgang, 9, 169
Good, Dr. James I., 47
Gospel, 45, 158, 243, 307
Fourth, 123, 159
Fundamental universals of, 203
John's, 159, 324
Luke's, 27, 159
Mark's, 124, 322
Matthew's, 323
Second, 124
Spirit of, 210
Gospel Age, Miracles of, 158
Gospels, 226, 230, 304, 326
Grace, 204,
Fruits of, 196
Greece, 36, 224
Gregory VII, Pope, 8, 9, 211, 257
Gregory the Great, 106

H

Haefling, 195
Hagenbach, Dr. K. R., 55, 61, 63, 73, 310
Halle, University of, 271
Harnack, Dr. Adolph, 150, 236, 239, 256, 302, 303, 306, 307, 308, 326
Hartmann, von, Eduard, 292, 294, 296
Heathenism, 62
Hebrews, The Epistle to, 235
Hegel, 48, 123, 219, 263, 276, 281, 305
Hegel, Philosophy of, 47, 91, 270
*Heidelberg Catechism*, 61, 71, 92, 97, 118
Heppe, Dr. H., 43
Heraclion, 159

Heresy, 160
Arian, 246
Gnostic, 184
Nestorian, 70
Heretics, Gnostic, 46
Herigar, Abbot of Laubes, 107
Herzog, J. J., 62
Hierarchy, 182
Hillel, 312, 313, 325
Historical Christ, 245, 246, 277, 291
Historical Jesus, 287, 294, 297, 319, 326
Historic Church, 207
History, 271, 275
History, Philosophy of, 266
Hochart, 295
Hodaja, 322
Hogan, Father, 215
Holsten, 255
Holy Eucharist, 104
Holy Ghost, 202, 205, 208, 289
Holy Scripture, 201, 208, 244, 245, 269
Holy Scripture, Authority of, 68
Holy Spirit, 193, 197, 206, 246, 289, 290
Fruit of, 119
Regency of, 45
Holy Supper, 192, 250
*Homousia*, 283
Huguenots, 213
Humanity, Generic, 8
Hurter, von, Friedrich, 10, 88, 90, 92, 94, 96, 101, 108, 111, 121
Huss, John, 141
Hyperorthodoxy, 275

I

Idea, Absolute, 280, 281
Idea, Messianic, 228, 306
Ideal Christ, 288, 290, 292, 294
Ignatius, 29, 159
Illuminati, 142
"Il Santo," 214, 309
Immaculate Conception, 146, 182, 254
Incarnation, 70, 91, 274, 279, 280
Doctrine of, 231
Index Expurgatorius, 175, 176, 215
India, 224
Indulgence, 59, 62, 176, 182
Infallibility, Papal, 166, 182
Innocent III, Pope, 10, 104, 112, 114, 257
Innocent III, Biography of, 91
Innocent III, Teaching concerning the Mass, 97
Inquisition, 21
Interpretation, Freedom of, 69
Investiture, Lay, 9, 211
Irenæus, 24, 30, 58, 159
Isaiah, 320, 321
Israel, 191, 312
Israel, Jahvidic Mission of, 312
Israel, Salvation of, 46

J

Jachmann, 293
*Jalkut Samuel*, 319
James, Apostle, 35
James, Epistle of, 68
James, Professor, 220
James, Protogospel of, 160
Jensen, P., 297, 298
Jerome of Prague, 141
Jerusalem, 205, 318
Jesus, 25, 124, 184, 192, 202, 206, 233, 235, 277, 285, 300, 305, 306, 312, 313, 323
Advent of, 312
Birth of, 160
Discourses of, 45
Historicity of, 286, 311, 316, 318
Idealistic view of, 126
Orthodox view of, 126
Resurrection of, 324
Schenkel's *Character Sketch of*, 56
Synoptic, 158
Jesus-Cult, 290
Jesus-Portrait, 257, 258, 259, 286
John, Apostle, 24
John, Baptist, 27, 313, 320, 323
John, Gospel of, 68, 159

Jordan, Herman, 284
Josephus, 313, 316
Joshua, 21
Judaism, 62, 218, 306
Judas Maccabæus, 322
Judea, 312
Justification, 44, 166
by faith, 201
by works, 201
Justin, 29
Justin Martyr, 159, 160

K

Kaehler, Martin, 153
*Kahal*, 191, 192, 193
*Kahal Jehova*, 192
Kant, Emmanuel, 57, 219, 261, 265, 292, 294, 305
Kenotic Theory, 152
Kepler, John, 21
Kiel, University of, 285
Kingdom of God, 193
Klee, Heinrich, 60
Klein, Dr. Gottlieb, 311, 312, 321, 322, 324, 326
Krummacher, Dr. F. W., 327
Kunze, Professor, 152

L

Langton, Stephen, 213
Laotse, 288
Lechler, Dr., 206
Legitimacy, Principle of, 201
Leibnitz, 49, 166
Leipolt, Dr. J., 285
Leo X, Pope, 175
Leo XIII, Pope, 216
Lessing, 51
Liberalism, 287, 288, 290
Liberalism, Jesus of, 294
Liberal Theology, 259, 286, 287
Libertines, in Geneva, 136
Literature, Pseudoclementine, 160
Lobstein, Professor, 240
Locke, John, 220
Logos, 104, 228, 283
Loisy, Dr. Alfred, 123, 165, 168, 169, 213, 215, 237, 257, 258, 260, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309
Loofs, Dr. F., 150
Lord's Prayer, 321
Lord's Supper, 61, 96, 121, 204, 249
Lothar, Count Segni, 11
Lotze, Hermann, 305
Luke, Gospel of, 27, 36, 147, 159
L'Union pour la Vérité, 214
Luther, Dr. Martin, 44, 48, 50, 59, 61, 67, 68, 76, 104, 166, 169, 185, 188, 199, 203, 204, 205, 210, 308
Luzzi, Giovanni, 209, 211

M

Macedonia, 36
Mainz, Bishop of, 174
Marburg, University of, 179
Marcion, 24, 29, 159
Marienminster, 171, 180
Mariolatry, 70
Mark, Gospel of, 28, 124
Mark, Gospel, Originality of, 125
Martensen, 266
Mass, 71, 84, 92, 96, 97, 101, 104, 112, 114, 116, 117, 128, 233, 244
*Mater Fidelium*, 194, 195
Matter, Intrinsic evil of, 233
Matthew, Gospel of, 27, 192
Matthew, chapter 16: 17, 18, 19. See pages 23, 25, 28, 148, 160
Maurus, Rabanus, 103
Maurus, Ratramnus, 103, 104
McGiffert, Dr. A. C., 183
Medievalism, 8, 189, 242
Melanchthon, Philip, 44, 133, 136, 188
Mercersburg College, 47
Messiah, 192, 307, 322
Messianic Age, 321, 324
Messianic Consciousness, 321, 324
Messianic Hope, 326
Meyer, von, J. F., 327

Meyer, Dr. H. A. W., 124
Michelet, K. L., 263
Middle Ages, 26, 94, 95, 116, 127, 166, 213
Midrash, 319
Mill, John Stuart, 220
Minot, Mgr., 216
Miracles, 263
Miracles, Medieval, 182
Mishna, Sanhedrin, 325
Mission, Messianic, 295
Mivart, Saint George, 168, 215
M. Moed Katon, 321
Modernism, 121, 123, 126, 168, 182, 217, 240, 241, 242, 243, 258, 300
Modernism, Dr. Caird's relation to, 217
Modernism, Definition of, 165
Modernism, Founder of, 215
Modernism, Interpreters of, 234
Modernists, 19, 49, 102, 114, 117, 158, 209, 246, 327
Modernists—
  Bible, 211
  Christian Socialistic, 210
  Eucharistic, 209
  Modernist Higher Critics, 212
  Reformatory, 209
Moehler, Dr. J. H., 45, 58, 241, 244
Monarchy, Papal, 29
Money Power, 211
Monism, 294
Monism, Theosophical, 292
Monists, 290
Monotheism, 312, 326
Montalembert, 110
Montanism, 25
Montanists, 159
Montanus, 24
Mosaic Law, 27, 325
Müller, Dr. Julius, 50, 200, 202, 205
Mysticism, 293
Mysticism, Hindoo, 224
Mystics, 166
Mythical Jesus, 320
Mythical Theory, 284, 327
Mythological Theory, 294
Mythus, 296, 297

N

Naturalism, 263, 264
Natural Religion, 218
Neander, Dr. August, 22
Needs, Human, 205
Nestorian Heresy, 70
Nevin, Dr. J. W., 47
New Covenant, 120
Newman, Cardinal, 50, 217, 241, 245, 256
Newman, Cardinal, *Grammar of Assent*, 220, 221
New Testament, 159, 171, 173, 175, 179, 189, 218
New Testament, Canon of, 160
New Testament Times, 318
Nicæa, 251
Nicæa, Synod of, 184
Nicene Position, 279
Nicholas II, Pope, 107
Nidda, 321
Noll, Karl, 255

O

Odysseus Legend, 297
Office, Charismatic, 197
Office, Pastoral, 198
Old Testament, 192
Old Testament, Canon of, 46, 161
*Opus operatum*, 87, 101, 250
Ordination of Barnabas, 206
Ordination of Saint Paul, 205, 206
Origen, 30, 51, 261
Original Sin, 145, 298
Orr, Dr. James, 145
Orthodoxy, Lutheran, 47
Oxford, 52, 217, 222

P

Pagans, 44
Palatinate, 53
Palestine, 34
Papacy, 26, 48, 127, 170, 190, 198, 212, 257
Papacy, Magna Charta of, 28
Papal Theory, 24
Particularism, Jewish, 27
Passover, 115

Paul, Apostle, 27, 73, 205, 207, 218, 226, 324, 325
Paul, Epistles of, 68
Paul IV, Pope, 175, 176, 177, 178
Paul V, Pope, 21
Paulinism, 62
Pelagian Controversy, 247
Pelagians, 44
Penance, False Theory of, 59
Pentateuch, 317
Personality, Concept of, 270
Personality, Divine, 53
Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich, 169
Peter, Apostle, 23, 205
Peter, First Epistle of, 68
Peter Rock Passage, 32
Peter Venerabilis, 109
Petros, 28
Pharisaism, 314
Pharisees, 314, 315, 318, 320
Philadelphia, Church of, 34, 35
Philip II, 141, 175
Philippi, 38
Philo, 228
Philosophy, German, 255
Philosophy, Hegelian, 91, 255
Philosophy, Neoplatonic, 224, 230
*Pirke Abot*, 325
Pius IV, Pope, 251
Plotinus, 224
Polycarp, 24, 159
Polytheism, 312
Polytheism, Greco-Roman, 244
Pontius Pilate, 236
Praxeas, 24
Preformation, Theory of, 48
Presbyterians, Scotch, 187
Priest, The Modernist, 114, 119
Priesthood, 198
Priesthood, of Believers, 60
Priesthood, Universal, 8
Primacy, The, 27, 29, 247
Primal Man, 276
Principle, Church-Organizing, 60
Principle, Formal, 60, 68
Principle, Material, 59, 60, 68
Principle, Social, 60
Printing, Invention of, 174, 177
Prophets, 318
Protestantism, 23, 76, 130, 134, 182, 201, 217, 240, 310
Protestantism, Apostle of, 202
  Essence of, 55, 80
  Ethical, 129
  Evangelical, 310, 311
  Lutheran, 68
  Material Principle of, 238
  Mission of, 83
  Principle of, 43, 47, 53, 55, 56, 71
  Reformed, 68, 72
  Roman Catholic view of, 44
  Terminology of, 47
Protestants, 135, 166
Ptolemæus, 159
Purgatory, 110

Q

Quesnel, Pasquier, 179

R

Rabbinic Lore, 311
Radbertus, Paschasius, 102, 104, 114
Rationalism, 142, 166, 263, 292
Rationalism, Christ of, 142
Rationalism, Idealistic, 123
Real Presence, 102, 249
Redeemer, 45
Reformation, 26, 48, 76, 104, 166, 188, 199, 307, 308, 310
Reformation, in Germany, 59
Reformation, Interpretation of, 47, 53
Reformation, Material Principle of, 59
Reformation, Philosophy of, 43, 203, 204
Reformation, Principle of, 43
Reformation, Protestant, 165
Reformers, 128, 130, 132, 139, 193
Regeneration, Baptismal, 249
Religion, Authority in, 68
  Christian, 100, 286
  Jewish, 205
  Philosophy of, 217

Religious Life, Symbols of, 223
Renaissance, 307
Renan, Ernst, *Vie de Jesu,* 124
Resurrection, 306, 317, 322, 323, 324
Revelation, Saint John, 34
Revival of Learning, 104
Rich, Edmund, 213
Richard, Cardinal, 304
Riddle, Dr. Matthew B., 125
Righteousness of Christ, 71
Ritschl, Dr. Albrecht, 152, 153, 305
Ritschlianism, 123, 304
Ritschlians, 158
Robertson, J. M., 295, 296
Robinson, Dr. E., 180
Roman Catholic Church, 40, 69, 72, 187, 197, 244, 250, 259, 300, 302, 304, 307
Roman Catholicism, 39, 72, 196, 201, 247
Roman Catholic Revival (1870), 203
Roman See, 26, 31, 247, 248
Romans, Epistle to, 68
Rome, 39
Rome, Church of, 214
Row, Rev. C. A. (Canon), 299
Rudolph II, 22
Rules, Hermeneutical, 82

S

Sabatier, Auguste, 217
Sabatier, Paul, 39, 114, 121, 217, 301
Sacrament, Doctrine of, 195
Sacraments, 105, 118, 197, 243
Sacraments, Function of, 81
Sadducees, 316, 317, 318, 323
Saint Sulpice, 215
Salvation, 44
Satan, 31
Satan, Synagogue of, 192
Saul, 205, 206
Schaeder, Professor, 152
Schaff, Dr. Philip, 31, 47, 51, 53, 166
Schaller, Dr. Julius, 271
Schelling, 219
*Schem hammephorasch,* 324
Schenkel, Dr. Daniel, 53, 55, 56, 57, 60, 63, 67, 69, 72, 88, 123, 141
Schenkel, *Characterbild Jesu,* 124, 126
Schism, concerning Faith and Reason, 219
Schleiermacher, Dr. F. E. D., 12, 47, 57, 60, 76, 123, 142, 145, 152, 153
Schleiermacher, *Das Leben Jesu,* 145
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 272
Science, 22, 155
Scripture, Canon of, 22, 158
Scriptures, 44, 46
Scriptures, The, faith in, 84
*Seder Elijahu rabba,* 323
See of Rome, 247, 248
Separatism, 197, 198
Separatist, 196
Servetus, Dr. Michael, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141
Servetus, Burning of, 139
Seven Churches of Asia, 34
Seventy, The, 191
Shebach, 322
Sigismund, Prince Archbishop of Vienna, 173
Simon ben Menasja, 318
Simon Peter, 29
Simony, Sin of, 10
Sin, Forgiveness of, 204
Sinaiticus, Codex, 31
Smeaton, George, 120
Smith, R. W., 296
Smyrna, 34
Socialists, 210
Socrates, 140, 288
Sodom, 77
Sorbonne, 179
Soteriology, 63, 310
Sovereignty, Divine, 205
Spinoza, 221
Stephen, Pope, 247, 248
Strauss, David Friedrich, 122, 260, 263, 264, 265, 268, 292, 294, 300, 326
Strauss, *Leben Jesu,* 91, 143, 263, 284
Strauss,Mythical Theory, 91,285

Strossmayer, Rt. Rev. J. G., 166
Succession, Apostolic, 202, 206
Sudhoff, Karl, 81
Symbol, Nicene, 50
Symbols, Confessional, 310
Synagogue, 191
Synods, General, 170
Syrians, The, 322

T

Tacitus, 236
*Talmud*, 315, 316, 317
Tarsus, 205
Tatian, 161
Tefilla, 322
Tertullian, 24, 25, 26, 30, 158, 249
Testament, New, 159, 171, 173, 175, 179, 189, 193, 205, 218, 285, 324
Testament, New, Canon of, 160
Testament, Old, 192
Testament, Old, Canon of, 46, 161
Theanthropic Humanity, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277
Theologians, German, 43
  Lutheran, 47
  Protestant, 185
  Reformed, 47
  Swiss, 43
Theology, 63, 218, 310
Theology, Modern, 292
Theophilus, 161
Thessalonica, 38
Thiersch, H. W. J., 60, 181
Thora, 317
Tiberius, 236
Tischendorf, von, L. F. K., 31, 158, 326
Tixeront, J., 246, 247, 249, 250, 253, 255, 257, 259, 260
Toulouse, 38
Toulouse, Catholic Institute of, 215
Tournon, Cardinal, 135
Tradition, 23, 45, 182
Traditionalists, Roman Catholic, 158
Tradition, Jewish, 321
Tradition, Patristic, 48
Tradition, Roman Catholic, 188
Transubstantiation, 92, 96, 102, 107, 114, 182, 245
Trent, Council of, 23, 49, 174, 251, 259
Trie, William de, 134, 135
Trinity, Doctrine of, 24, 150, 153, 231, 236, 254, 264, 279
Trinity, Tri-Personal, 279
Triune God, 195
Troas, 36
Troeltsch, Ernst, 298
Truth, Christian, 182
Truth, of faith, 127
Truth, of science, 127
Tübingen School, 26, 33, 38
Twesten, Dr. A. D. C., 47
Tyrrell, Rev. George, 165, 168, 169, 215, 237, 240, 246

U

Ubiquity, Doctrine of, 104, 245
Ueberweg, 263
Ullmann, Karl, 55, 326
Ultramontanism, 177, 209, 243
*Unio mystica*, 324
Union, Church, 66, 86
Union, Protestant, 57
Union Theological Seminary, 180
Universalism of Luke's Gospel, 28
University, Heidelberg, 53
University, Marburg, 179
Unseen Presence, 233
Urban VIII, Pope, 21

V

Valentinian, Gnostic System of, 159
Valentinus, 24
Van Ess, Karl, 171
Van Ess, Leander, 171, 178, 179
Vatican, 211, 215
Vatican Council, 49, 146, 166, 259
Villecourt, Bishop Clemens, 9

Virgin Birth, 91, 97, 100, 114, 123, 125, 145, 157, 183, 233, 234, 236, 305
Virgin Mary, 209, 254
Voight, Johannes, 9
Vollers, Karl, 296
Vow, Anti-Modernist, 165, 181, 182
Vulgar Rationalism, Christ of, 269
*Vulgata*, 23
*Vulgate*, 174

W

Walsh, J. G., 178
Walter, Michael, 178
Washington, Catholic University of, 215
Weiss, Dr. Bernard, 32, 33, 36, 46, 125
Wessenberg, von, Count Ignaz H., 169, 170, 171
Wittenbach, 62
Wittenberg, 62
Word of God, 211
World-View, Medieval, 111
World-View, Modern, 112, 151, 251, 290, 298
Wrede, 255

Y

Yves de la Brière, Père, 39

Z

Zahn, Dr. Adolph, 204
Zwingli, Huldreich, 50, 61, 96, 104, 136, 169, 185, 188, 199, 203

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## Date Due

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| MAY 17 '56 | | | |
| MAY 23 '58 | | | |
| JAN 21 '57 | | | |
| 26 '58 | | | |
| FEB 18 '59 | | | |
| NOV 18 '59 | | | |
| FEB 28 '60 | | | |
| MAR 27 '63 | | | |
| APR 5 '63 | | | |
| Indefs. | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

DATE DUE
WITHDRAWN
from

270.6 R92 c.1
Rust, John Benjamin. 150101 000
Modernism and the Reformation.
3 9315 00005479 8
MANCHESTER COLLEGE LIBRARY

270.6
R92
Rust
Modernism and the reformation

270.6
R92
11603

## Manchester College Library

### RULES

1. Books of fiction may be kept two weeks and may be renewed once for the same period. The time limit for books of non-fiction shall be determined by the librarian.

2. A fine of one cent a day shall be charged on each book kept overtime, except reserved books. A fine of two cents per hour will be charged for reserved books which are not returned at the time specified by the librarian when the book is taken. No book will be issued to persons incurring such fines until they have been paid.

3. All injuries to books beyond reasonable wear and all losses shall be made good to the satisfaction of the librarian.